DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 386 HE 013 902

TITLE	State Leadership: A Positive Force in Postsecondary Education. Proceedings of the Leadership Seminar of the Inservice Education Program (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, May 21-24, 1975).
INSTITUTION	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo. Inservice Education Program.; Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.; State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.
SPONS AGENCY	Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
REPORT NO	IEP-909
PUB DATE	May 75
NOTE	71p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Freedom; *Accountability; Budgeting; *College Planning; Declining Enrollment; Federal Government; Federal State Relationship; Financial Problems; *Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Institutional Autonomy; Legislators; Nontraditional Education; *Postsecondary Education; Private Colleges; Proprietary Schools; Public Policy; *Resource Allocation; State Colleges; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Seminars for State Leaders Postsec Ed (ECS SHEEO)

ABSTRACT

Proceedings are provided of a seminar on state leadership that focused on: (1) the process of state planning in public, private, and proprietary postsecondary educational institutions; (2) the process of resource allocation in a changing educational environment; (3) the emerging conflicts flowing from the legislated rise in accountability; and (4) the future that state postsecondary education leadership may take, with recognition of federal influences. Case studies and the following papers are presented: "Total State Planning for Postsecondary Education," by Prince B. Woodard; "The Impact of State and Federal Funding Regulations of Nontraditional Postsecondary Education," by Richard L. Meeth; "Accountability, Conflict, and Academic Freedom in Higher Education," by Larry L. Leslie; "New Assumptions for State Leadership in the Future," by Robert B. Mautz; and "Personal Perspectives of Federal/State Roles in Postsecondary Education," by Robert C. Andringa. Among the specific topics of dicussion are the following: strategic versus tactical planning, the way that funding formulas and guidelines affect nontraditional programs, the relationship between state coordinating boards and colleges and universities, the effects of financial problems and the decline of traditional college students, and authorizing committees, appropriations committees, and budget committees of the 94th Congress of the United States. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED202386

STATE LEADERSHIP: A POSITIVE FORCE IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

I
E
P

Proceedings of the
Leadership Seminar
of the
Inservice Education Program
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
May 21-24

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Cosponsored by
EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES
and
STATE HIGHER EDUCATION EXECUTIVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ECS
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

In Cooperation With
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

HE 013 902

Under a Grant from
The W. K. Kellogg Foundation

Inservice Education Program Seminars

STATE LEADERSHIP: A POSITIVE FORCE IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Proceedings of the
Leadership Seminar
of the
Inservice Education Program
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
May 21-24

Cosponsored by
EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES
and
STATE HIGHER EDUCATION EXECUTIVE OFFICERS
ASSOCIATION

In Cooperation With
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Under a Grant from
The W. K. Kellogg Foundation

CONTENTS

Page

Preface i

Seminar Program iii

Session I

"Total State Planning for Postsecondary Education"
Prince B. Woodard 1

Case Studies for Discussion 8

Session II

"The Impact of State and Federal Funding Regulations on Non-traditional Postsecondary Education"
Richard L. Meeth 13

Case Studies for Discussion 31

Session III

"Accountability, Conflict, and Academic Freedom in Higher Education"
Larry L. Leslie 34

Case Study for Discussion 47

Luncheon Session

"New Assumptions for State Level Leadership in the Future"
Robert B. Mautz 48

Session IV

"Personal Perspectives of Federal/State Roles in Postsecondary Education"
Robert C. Andringa 53

Appendix A - Participants 61

PREFACE

During the past year, the Education Commission of the States and the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association, with the support of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, jointly began the implementation of an Inservice Education Program under the direction of Warren G. Hill, former Chancellor of the Connecticut Commission for Higher Education. The purpose of the I.E.P. is to provide for state leaders in postsecondary education a coordinated source for contemporary research and ideas on the issues and tasks which confront them. To this end, during this first year, the I.E.P. has presented a number of national seminars to bring together state leadership and resource persons for the discussion of selected topics of current concern.

The Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, has been pleased to coordinate this particular I.E.P. seminar focused upon selected issues of state level leadership for postsecondary education, held in Philadelphia, May 21-24. In the conference, we concentrated on these areas: (1) the process of state planning which includes all of a state's postsecondary education systems--public, private, and proprietary, (2) the process of resource allocation in a changing postsecondary environment, (3) the emerging conflicts flowing from the legislated rise in accountability, and (4) the future directions that state postsecondary

education leadership may take, with due recognition of federal influences. This monograph contains the texts of the presentations and the prepared case studies.

The seminar drew participants from as far away as Hawaii, representing lay and professional leaders from a number of state boards and agencies for postsecondary education systems and subsystems. We certainly appreciate their lively participation in the sessions and believe that they found the discussions stimulating and useful. We, of course, appreciate the fine work of each of our session resource experts whose contributions are contained herein. Warren Hill's constant support was both necessary and valued. Kenneth Fischer, Director, Institute for Education Leadership Convening Authority, George Washington University, served as general discussion facilitator for each of the sessions. Of special assistance were the graduate research assistants who aided in preparing materials for this seminar: Ms. Sherry Thomas, Mr. Fred Kiehle, Mr. Jay Rowell, and Mr. Bruce Ivey. Mr. Kiehle is also due special thanks for his help in preparing these proceedings. All these individuals have made outstanding contributions to the ultimate success of this particular seminar. We thank them all!

Summer, 1975
Gainesville, Florida

James L. Wattenbarger
Director
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida

SEMINAR PROGRAM

Wednesday, May 21, 1975

3:00 P.M.	Registration	1st Floor Foyer
6:00 P.M.	Reception	Tecumseh Room

Thursday, May 22, 1975

9:00 A.M.	SESSION ONE "Total State Planning for Postsecondary Education" Dr. Prince Woodard, President Mary Washington College, Former Chancellor, West Virginia Board of Higher Education	Poor Richard Room
10:15 A.M.	COFFEE	Outside Crystal Room
10:30 A.M.	CASE STUDY: SESSION ONE	Poor Richard
12:00 Noon	LUNCHEON MEETING	North Cameo Lounge
2:00 P.M.	SESSION TWO "Allocation and Reallocation of College Resources" Dr. Richard Meeth, Professor State University of New York at Buffalo Dr. Kenneth Fischer, Director Institute for Educational Leadership Convening Uathority, George Washington University	Poor Richard Room
3:00 P.M.	REFRESHMENTS	Outside Crystal Room
3:30 P.M.	CASE STUDY: SESSION TWO	Poor Richard
5:00 P.M.	Meetings Adjourn	
7:00 P.M.	Reception (Cash Bar)	Viennese Room

Friday, May 23, 1975

9:00 A.M.	SESSION THREE "Accountability and Academic Freedom" Dr. Larry Leslie, Professor of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University	Poor Richard
10:15 A.M.	COFFEE	Outside Crystal Room
10:30 A.M.	CASE STUDY: SESSION THREE	
12:00	LUNCHEON Presiding: Dr. Ben L. Morton Chancellor, West Virginia Board of Regents Presentation: Dr. Robert Mautz Chancellor, Florida University System "New Assumptions for State Level Leadership in the Future"	Viennese Room
1:30 P.M.	SESSION FOUR "Future Directions in State Level Leadership" Dr. Robert Andringa, Minority Staff Director for Education and Labor Committee, U. S. House of Representatives	Poor Richard
3:15 P.M.	REFRESHMENTS	Outside Crystal Room
5:00 P.M.	GROUP MEETING ADJOURNS	

Saturday, May 24, 1975

9:00 A.M.	PANEL DISCUSSION "Feedback and Summary Session" Dr. James L. Wattenbarger Dr. Louis W. Bender Dr. Robert Andringa Dr. Kenneth Fischer Dr. Robert Mautz Dr. Prince Woodard	Poor Richard Assembly Room

10:15 A.M.	COFFEE	Outside Crystal Room
12:00	CONFERENCE ADJOURNS	

SESSION I

TOTAL STATE PLANNING FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Prince B. Woodard

Total state planning for postsecondary education is in its infancy. In the years ahead research, trial and error efforts and the accumulation of a mass of experience will teach us much about the state planning process. We have a great deal to learn.

I have been a student of higher education administration and a participant in the higher education planning process for more than twenty years. Over this span of time I have occupied a variety of planning roles including those of chief executive officer of a state coordinating council, chancellor of a state governing board responsible for fifteen colleges and universities, and president of a state, four year liberal arts college. Perhaps it is because my perspective has changed so many times that I sense much remains to be learned regarding both the processes and procedures of effective total state planning for postsecondary education. My remarks will focus on "planning principles" which I have formulated on the basis of my experiences in state planning for postsecondary education.

Fundamental to my presentation is acceptance of the fact that a recital of the need for state-wide planning is not required. Hundreds of pages have been written, especially in the last several years, attesting to this need.

Further, the assumption underlying my comments is that all in this audience concur in the belief that comprehensive state planning should be a positive force, a leadership function, concerned with policies, procedures and practices which provide for all citizens adequate and appropriate postsecondary educational opportunities of high quality.

Before delineating what I consider to be "essential principles" of total state-wide planning for postsecondary education, let me identify the several planning groups which I feel should utilize the principles I shall discuss.

Today we have state coordinating or state governing boards in nearly all states. These coordinate, or coordinate-govern a variety of postsecondary elements. Some have responsibility for four year institutions, others are concerned with all public institutions, while still others embrace all public institutions and in a limited way include private institutions as well. In addition, we now have in all but four states (Colorado, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Wisconsin) State 1202 Commissions responsible for total state-wide postsecondary

Dr. Woodard is the President, Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg, Virginia, and former Chancellor, West Virginia Board of Higher Education.

planning thereby allowing the state to qualify for federal funding under Title X of Education Amendment of 1972. These commissions are expected to plan for total postsecondary education. They are new, having been in operation one year or less, and what they will actually achieve is yet to be seen. As planning bodies, all of these various boards and commissions may find the following planning principles of value.

It should be understood that basic planning principles cannot be totally isolated one from another. They interrelate. For discussion purposes only, each is presented as a totally separate principle.

Stated in its simplest form, the first principle to be observed is the need for an official mandate for state planning. While of a different nature than the other principles to be cited, this first principle is basic and fundamental.

Total state planning for postsecondary education does not become a reality by merely recognizing a need for it. There must be a legal base for planning. Legal authority may be contained in state statutes, executive orders, or other official and valid instruments of government. In addition to the need for a clear legal basis, a substantial and sustaining state commitment in support of planning is also required. By this, I mean financial support for a professional staff of high competence. Quality state planning is dependent upon a quality staff and the procurement and retention of a competent professional staff is dependent upon an attractive salary structure.

Closely allied to the point that quality planning requires quality staff is the related principle that no state planning body should attempt to develop a staff possessing all needed planning competencies. This is impractical, if not impossible. Specialists will be needed and should be brought in to perform specific tasks and offer periodic guidance and counsel to the planning body. Adequate funds must be available for this purpose.

Finally, a genuine mandate for successful state planning requires a policy board or commission whose members are dedicated to service and committed to the promotion of postsecondary educational opportunities to serve the needs of all citizens. These board members must be insightful, must view their role as one of public service, must be politically astute, but should <u>not</u> be political-office oriented.

I place <u>the need for a clear and categorical mandate for state planning as the first and foremost principle</u> for without it, even though the need for planning may be clearly identified, only limited success will be obtained.

<u>A second principle</u> basic to successful total state planning for postsecondary education <u>is to develop full knowledge of the authority and responsibilities for postsecondary education of the several segments</u>

of state government. In any state both the executive and legislative branches of government have a major impact on what happens to post-secondary education. The primary postsecondary planning body and its staff should seek effective ways to keep both branches fully informed of the priority needs, strengths, weaknesses, and future plans for postsecondary education. Similarly close communication, cooperation and sharing of information must be maintained with other agencies of government such as state and regional comprehensive planning bodies, the state board for elementary and secondary education, state budget office, state office of personnel, environmental control office and others. Each of these may have legal responsibilities for certain aspects of postsecondary education. It is wise and productive to be of every possible assistance and to maintain close communication with all state agencies and offices that relate in any way to postsecondary education.

The third principle I wish to offer is that it is important that the current and projected status of all existing units in the post-secondary education enterprise be fully understood.

In any state there will be a variety of public, private and proprietary postsecondary institutions. The planning agency should give prompt study to the stated mission, goals and objectives of each of these institutions. One helpful approach is to survey the statutes or charters creating the various operations. Next a review of institutional publications will reveal how the institution advertises itself to external audiences. In all likelihood it will be discovered that many institutions present quite different data to different audiences. A student recruitment brochure is likely to emphasize a low student-faculty ratio, perhaps 10 to 1, while an institutional report seeking financial support from the state will stress the high productivity of the institution.

Development of an inventory of vital statistics for each institution including such items as enrollment, employees, physical plant, financial status including endowments programs offered, and the stated future goals, directions, and aspirations of the institution provides excellent planning resources. It cannot be stressed too strongly that each institution should be specifically encouraged to present a clear and full statement of mission to the planning body as a matter of record. This will provide the planning agency a base point for its work with each participant in the postsecondary educational enterprise in the state.

Fourthly, it is essential that proper differentiation and attention be directed within the on-going planning process to the components of total planning; strategic planning and tactical planning. In its 1971 report, "Comprehensive Planning for Postsecondary Education," the ECS Task Force on Statewide Comprehensive Planning for Postsecondary Education defined the two as follows:

STRATEGIC PLANNING. Strategic planning provides the framework within which tactical planning is developed and implemented. It is subject to few changes (if any) between major planning cycles and ought to reflect the fundamental assumptions about postsecondary education, the long-range societal objectives and goals, and the principal missions, roles, and functions of all educational institutions and agencies.

TACTICAL PLANNING. Tactical planning takes place within the parameters of strategic planning. Its elements include short- and intermediate-range goals, developmental time frames, and step-by-step means for achieving strategic goals. Tactical planning may be concerned with any element of postsecondary education, including such diverse items as new campus sites, new programs of instruction, research and public service, student grants and aids, building programs and priorities, budget formulas and processes, and management systems. Care must be exercised to insure that when tactical decisions amend or void strategic concepts all interested parties are fully cognizant of such proposed changes and are given public opportunity to debate their desirability. Tactical planning is a continuous process with one cycle overlapping or following immediately upon the previous one.

As defined, strategic planning establishes the "broad frame of reference, the fundamental premises and the philosophies and purposes" to be observed in tactical planning. Tactical planning, on the other hand, focuses on a limited set of issues and problems which have high priority within the larger strategic framework. Both processes are basic to sound planning and each has a direct bearing on the other.

Another principle which merits consideration is that all elements of the postsecondary education constituency should be provided an opportunity to participate in the planning process. There is no substitute for the involvement of interested and knowledgeable people. When lay citizens, legislators, faculty, students and administrators have continuing opportunities to assist in the identification of problems, provide ideas and formulate proposals they become the key to having "what is planned" become "what is."

It should be fully understood that the principle of involvement does not mean responsibility for the planning process is turned over to committees with diverse memberships. It does mean that the designated planning agency recognizes the value of obtaining advice and counsel from any and all constructive sources.

In strategic planning a cross section of all interests should be represented and highly competent staff personnel should be available to provide relevant background data and to serve as professional resource personnel. Often these advisory bodies are designed as blue ribbon committees on long-range planning, educational policy, etc. When such committees are created by the planning agency it is important that a charter or statement of responsibilities be developed and reviewed with the group.

In tactical planning more specialized advisory groups are often most helpful. For example, a committee of financial aid officers from public, private, and proprietary institutions may be the ideal body to advise on state policy for student aid. Similarly, a committee of academic deans from all sectors would be most valuable in academic program planning at the state level.

Before you ask, let me state that it does indeed take a great deal of staff time to work with a broad scope of advisory personnel. But I hasten to add that I know of no better use of staff time when measured by the potential long-range benefits which may accrue to the planning process.

The next principle I wish to stress is that sufficient current, relevant and reliable data must be developed and maintained. Sufficient is a key word. I use it by design. It will never be possible to have "all the data." Some charged with state-wide planning do not seem to understand this and wait and wait to get all the facts and in turn never really plan. Others act without determining what data can be obtained or without considering the possible value of additional data. Both approaches are indefensible.

Inasmuch as state-wide postsecondary educational planning and coordination will always be concerned with priority resource allocations of dollars, programs, buildings, personnel, etc., there will be those who take exception to any plan. Opponents of a plan will seek to discredit the planners and the plan by presenting information and facts which they will claim the planners did not properly consider or overlooked. If these opponents do indeed present "facts" not considered by the planners, regardless of the true importance of these facts, the credibility of both the planner and the plan is immediately in jeopardy.

With today's technology there is no reason why any planning agency should remain for long without a comprehensive data base and a management information system. It is a must. Here we are truly only beginning to make major strides. Much more will be said about this throughout the workshop. It is essential, however, to differentiate between what data is needed for strategic and tactical planning and what are just interesting.

Another principle which merits full consideration is that there must exist both the capacity and willingness to make and implement decisions.

This principle relates to the competence and commitment of both the policy planning body and its staff. It embraces both the "know how" and the "determination" of those responsible for state-wide planning.

A coordinating agency with clearly defined objectives, a commitment to quality higher education and to efficient management practices is going to find disfavor with some members of the higher education system and the public as well. If there is one thing that my years of experience in higher education planning and coordination has taught me is that many of the strongest advocates of coordination and planning, especially members of legislative bodies, quickly put this view aside when actions of a planning agency affect their alma maters or their constituency. In other words, coordination is a must in their view so long as it doesn't apply to "their school" or "their geographical area."

Related to the basic point that the staff and board members of a planning agency must have the capacity and motivation to make decisions is the necessity for the agency to be willing to oversee the implementation of decisions. Planners cannot be worried about winning, or for that matter, even engaging in popularity contests.

As an eighth principle for total state planning of postsecondary education I would urge that timely and continuous dissemination of information be provided. This element is closely identified with the decision making responsibility of the planning and coordinating agency. It is my personal opinion that one of the weakest characteristics of current state-wide higher educational planning and coordinating operations is the failure to disseminate information in an effective manner.

Up to now state planning agencies have focused on the publication of statistical reports and massive planning documents. These are necessary for certain audiences but they have little general public reader appeal. Brief summary reports attractively designed are very much needed to transmit a message to the general public. Extensive use should also be made of radio, television and the other media to transmit important policy decisions and new postsecondary educational developments.

Within the educational community all parties should be kept fully informed through in-house documents and both formal and informal reports and proceedings.

Lastly, I must stress the importance of meeting dates and official sessions of the planning bodies being fully known. Ample provisions should be made to accommodate all who wish to attend.

Another principle is that both the planning process and the postsecondary education plans should be given periodic review and evaluation.

Effective comprehensive planning and coordination is a continuous process. All facets require a close inspection to determine their effectiveness. Many informal review and evaluation procedures will take place as a matter of course. These are important, but not enough. Specific and planned check points must be built into the process to insure adequate evaluation of the process and the product.

There is a tendency in planning and coordination for those involved to become preoccupied with the "plan" which has been developed and because of this preoccupation fail to remain keenly attuned to changing conditions. For this reason it is imperative from time to time for those doing the planning and coordination to go outside the existing structure and obtain an impartial evaluation of the state of affairs. I favor a comprehensive external evaluation at least every five years.

There are a variety of other reasons why review, evaluation and revision must be a fundamental component of the coordinating process. The composition of policy boards change, economic conditions are in a constant state of flux, and enrollment patterns vary to mention but a few. Often planning and coordinating groups are assigned or somehow assume additional functions. I agree with the Carnegie Commission when it suggests that the agency's planning activities should be tested against the criterion: "Is it high level planning or low level regulation?"

The final planning principle I wish to identify is one which deserves special consideration because it is all too easy to overlook. It is a plea to be aware of the impact on planning which may result from a change in the cast of participants in the planning process. A new governor, a change in political party control of the legislature, new members on the postsecondary education planning board or a change in the executive officer of the planning board may all have a substantial influence on existing plans and provide new directions for future plans. The ramifications of this point are many. For example, new membership in the planning board may lead to a change in established funding guidelines for state financial support for postsecondary institutions or the enactment of more stringent or more liberal program approval provisions. Consider what this may do to the credibility of post-secondary education planning in the eyes of state legislators if full rationale for the change is not carefully presented. Or as another example, consider the impact on the planning process by having a governor assume office whose campaign theme was to cut state expenditures twenty percent in twelve months. These and other unanticipated events do take place.

Although each of the points identified could be discussed at length, I conclude with two general observations. While total state planning is indeed in its infancy, it will mature rapidly and successfully provided sound guidelines and planning principles are observed and participants in the process maintain a dedicated commitment to the task which is theirs. Comprehensive state planning is essential if adequate postsecondary educational opportunities are to be provided to the citizens of any state in the most efficient and economical manner.

Session I - Case Study 1

The Higher Education Council for Progressive State, the State agency established by statute to coordinate public higher education in the State, published eighteen months ago a State plan for higher education for Progressive State. In developing the Plan, the Council held extensive consultations with presidents and trustees of each of the 21 public four-year colleges and universities, the Chancellor and trustees of the 16-unit State Community College System and the presidents and board chairmen of the 14 private four-year colleges in the State. The Plan presented comprehensive data on enrollment projections, degree production, facilities (including utilization and quantitative and qualitative inventories), instructional costs, etc.

Immediate and subsequent reaction the the Plan was highly favorable. Within two months after the Plan was published, the Association of Private Colleges formally commended the Council "for its perceptive and common-sense recommendations for advancing the dual system of public and private higher education in the State." In addressing the State Legislature three months after the Plan was released, the Governor stated: "At last, the State has a clear set of guidelines to chart the course of higher education in the State for the immediate years ahead." A large majority of the recommendations requiring legislative action received favorable consideration by the Legislature in its annual session which ended six months ago. So, in summary, the future of higher education in Progressive State appeared to be firmly charted and broadly supported.

One categorical conclusion contained in the Plan was that the State needed no additional four-year colleges, universities, or professional schools--public or private. It was pointed out in the document that several private and public four-year colleges were underenrolled and that curriculum changes may be needed in these institutions to attract increased enrollment.

The Plan also noted that over the past several years considerable public concern had been expressed over the inability of the two law schools in the State (one public and one private) to accept all qualified

State residents who were applying for admission. Data were presented which revealed that only one out of every six qualified State applicants had been admitted to either of the law schools during the past year. The Plan pointed out, however, that the ratio of lawyers to total population in Progressive State was greater than the national average and to increase the number of law degrees awarded annually would yield more legally-trained manpower than a recent American Bar Association study had indicated was needed in the State.

Ten days ago (almost precisely eighteen months after publication of the State Plan), at a news conference called by Harvey College, one of the underenrolled four-year private colleges and the only senior institution located in the Capital City of the State, the President and Trustees of the College announced that the College and all assets would be given to the State, provided it would be converted into a State law school and graduate school of business.

The Trustees of the non-sectarian institution indicated that over the past two years it had been necessary to use reserve funds to meet operating costs, but that the College was debt free. They reported that the physical plant was valued at 16 million dollars; that the endowment and reserve fund at the end of the fiscal year would be approximately 1.5 million dollars; that the College was located within three blocks of the State Capitol and Supreme Court building; that the College site provided parking for 600 cars; and that Capital City was the largest city in the State and the closest law school or graduate program in business was in the State University 70 miles away.

Speaking also at the news conference was the President of the Capital City Bar Association, the President of the City Chamber of Commerce, the Mayor, and the Chairman of the State Senate Finance Committee (a lawyer and local resident), each of whom enthusiastically endorsed the proposal and commended the Trustees for their magnanimous offer to the State.

Contacted immediately after the news conference, the Governor, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House (all of the same and controlling political party) praised the Trustees for their generous offer and indicated they could see many positive benefits from such a development. Each indicated he would anticipate an early recommendation from the Higher Education Council as to the precise course of action that the State should take.

When the Chairman of the Higher Education Council was contacted by the news media at his home in Xville, 120 miles from Capital City, his response was one of disbelief. "Our plan is clear and fully understood," he replied. "We don't need another law school, and

certainly the State has no need to spend more tax money to support another State institution."

Within the next week, the Governor, by written request, asked the Higher Education Council to carefully review the offer (a copy of which he enclosed with his letter) and present a recommendation to him within two months.

Overnight, it seems, everyone decided to get into the act, with two strong camps, the "pros" and the"cons," quickly being formed. Resolutions were passed by the Trustees of the State University and several of the State four-year colleges opposing the proposal. Several of the private colleges expressed support for the development, as did many of the civic and professional organizations in Capital City. Reaction from individual legislators was broad and very clearly split on the proposal. Both the State Bar and the State Chamber of Commerce offered their cooperation and assistance to the Higher Education Council in their study of the offer.

The first meeting of the Higher Education Commission since the proposal was made by Harvey College is scheduled for tomorrow. The Chairman has requested each Council member to outline the procedure he feels the Council should follow in this matter.

Basis for Discussion

1. Assume you are a member of the Higher Education Council, state and justify the procedure you would propose.

2. Assume you are the Director of the Council (the professional executive), state and justify the procedure you would propose.

Session I - Case Study 2

For more than a year, the State Coordinating Council for Higher Education has worked to formulate a policy whereby a "comprehensive program of continuing education (both credit and non-credit offerings) may be provided in a non-duplicating, economical manner by the State institutions of higher education to citizens throughout the State." This is a charge to the Council by statute.

As finally developed, in consultation with the presidents of all the State colleges and universities, the policy provides for dividing the State geographically into continuing education regions, with the colleges in each region responsible for providing continuing education opportunities within that geographical area. Each region contains at least a community college, a four-year college, and a master's-

degree-granting institution. The policy further provides that the two comprehensive State universities may offer in any region throughout the State specialized continuing education activities which institutions within a region do not have the capacity to provide. The policy, in draft form, was endorsed by the public college and university presidents by a vote of 16 to 1. The one opposing vote was cast by the president of the State university currently providing undergraduate and graduate level continuing education offerings throughout the State.

In its formal announcement of the new policy, the Council indicated it would become fully operative within one year.

Shortly after the policy was disseminated, several public school superintendents indicated strong opposition, and soon thereafter, the State Association of School Superintendents, in its annual meeting, passed a formal resolution of opposition to the policy. Several superintendents were quoted in the press as saying "if the State university could not continue to provide continuing education offerings for their teachers, they would contract with out-of-State institutions for the service." (As a matter of information, these superintendents had sometimes been employed by the University to teach continuing education courses.)

With the State Legislature in session at the time of the Council policy announcement, a bill was soon introduced to authorize the State University to continue its existing scope of continuing education offerings, inasmuch as it had the expertise, experience, and support of the public school superintendents.

In spite of testimony by the Director of the Council of Higher Education and several college presidents in opposition to the bill, it passed the Education Committee of the State Senate and was approved by the Senate. The bill was then referred to the Education Committee of the House of Delegates.

A hearing by this Committee is to be held in three days.

1. As Chairman of the Higher Education Council, what action pattern do you recommend?

2. As Director of the Higher Education Council, what action pattern do you recommend?

Session I - Case Study 3

The policy of the State Council of Higher Education, which by statute must approve new degree programs before they may be offered

by the State institutions of higher education, requires institutions to submit and have approved letters of intent to start a new program at least two and one-half years before implementing a new program.

Several of the State four-year colleges have recently suffered substantial losses in enrollment and have excess faculty and facilities. Studies by the Council and others suggest that many students are seeking something other than a liberal arts undergraduate education. Thus, it appears that enrollment problems can be expected to continue for these institutions unless changes are made.

The presidents of four of the most severely affected colleges and the chairmen of their boards of trustees have requested the Council to revise its policy on program approval to permit requests to be submitted up to six months prior to the proposed date of implementation. A major argument favoring this revised timetable is that immediate and imaginative action must be taken to keep these institutions viable.

Institutions other than the four requesting the policy change have also expressed the desire for greater flexibility in initiating new programs. They argue that now is the time to return to the institutions a greater control over what they offer and when they offer it.

Basis for Discussion

1. As a member of the Council of Higher Education, what action do you recommend and why?

SESSION II

THE IMPACT OF STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDING REGULATIONS ON NON-TRADITIONAL POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

L. Richard Meeth

Innovative programs in American postsecondary education are not always received with open arms by traditional faculty, administrators, state boards, or legislators. Sometimes these programs have been tolerated, sometimes encouraged, sometimes prematurely forced to justify their existence, and sometimes thrust onto reluctant institutions by state boards. Even though innovative programs are by definition non-traditional, they compete with traditional education for funding and are accorded or denied it by the same criteria. Since the programs are largely efforts to explore and demonstrate effective teaching and learning not present in traditional postsecondary education, the appropriateness of judging their financial right to life by traditional standards is questionable.

Responding to a growing concern among administrators of innovative programs, the Institute for Educational Leadership of the George Washington University, under a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, commissioned a study to determine the nature and extent of restraints imposed by state and federal funding formulas, guidelines and regulations on emerging, innovative, time- and place-free opportunities in postsecondary education. This report is meant to open discussion, describe the range and scope of funding problems for nontraditional programs, and initiate a compendium of possible solutions that might be acted on by each state in the near future.

To gather information on the range of funding problems being experienced by nontraditional education in the United States, lengthy interviews were conducted with administrators of College IV of Grand Valley State in Michigan; the experimental colleges of the State University of New York at Buffalo; Empire State College, the external degree program in New York; the program of modularized general education at Bowling Green State University in Ohio; College III, the competency-based program of public and community service of the University of Massachusetts at Boston; and the external degree program of the Community College of Vermont.

Dr. Meeth is Associate Professor of Higher Education, State University of New York at Buffalo, and a consultant in the field of resource allocation in postsecondary education.

In addition, a questionnaire was mailed to over 300 nontraditional programs identified as "new or unconventional forms of post-secondary education free of traditional time or place limitations."[1] One hundred thirty-four of these questionnaires were returned, 48 respondents indicating some serious problem with state or federal funding formulas and 86 institutions reporting no particular problems with funding. Even though few programs cited serious difficulty, many more have experienced the problems and compromised their integrity in order to exist. Others would have had the problems but felt the obstacles too great to even begin a program and, in fairness, others have had no problems because of very cooperative state boards and legislatures.

Of those reporting great difficulty with state or federal funding agencies 70 percent were public and 30 percent private--about the same as the public-private ratio in the total responses. Almost 85 percent of the programs with funding problems were parts of traditional institutions--again the same as the percentage of such programs in the total response. Thus, public college and university programs operating within larger traditional schools seem to have the greatest difficulty with funding guidelines.

In addition to being queried about guideline problems, directors of nontraditional programs were asked about other problems with state and federal agencies. In this connection, half the respondents reported problems related to program approval, program exclusion, and faculty work requirements.

The results of these 134 questionnaires were tabulated and, together with the interviews, comprise the data for this report. Before the funding problems of nontraditional programs are considered, it might be useful to review briefly the formulas from which many of the problems arise.

Funding Formulas

Formulas or guidelines are used in two-thirds of the states. In 1973, twenty-five states used formulas, eight had guidelines similar to the formulas, but not as comprehensive, and three states used program budgeting.[2] Eight other states, which had previously used budget formulas for allocating funds to institutions of higher education, had abandoned the practice by 1973.

The language of these formulas is complex. As with every technical field, a highly specialized language has developed which is somehwat difficult for outsiders to understand. Three basic computational methods are employed:

1. The rate per base factor, which, in lay language, means that a university's operating costs of the preceding year, divided by such measures as credit hours, and square feet, are multiplied by a fixed rate of increase to determine the budget for the current year. Thus, if instructional salaries were a million dollars the year before and the rate is 1.10, the salaries will go up one hundred thousand dollars.

2. The percentage of base factor, which is a straight percentage increase over the previous year's costs, again computed by unit measures such as full-time-equivalent students.

3. The base factor-position ratio, which is the preceding year's costs shaped by separately established student-faculty ratios and salary rates. This third computational method takes into account fluctuating enrollment. For example, if full-time students decrease, the state can maintain the ratio and cut faculty or change the ratio and maintain the faculty.[3]

No state uses all three methods, nor do all states use any one method. Computation by the percentage of base factor is most commonly used to estimate funds for organized activities related to instruction. This category, of great concern to nontraditional programs, covers departmental research, faculty and related staff salaries, and direct instructional expenses incurred by departments.

The difference between base-factor computations and zero-base-factor computations is another important concept in formula budgeting. Budgets are built either on the previous year's costs or the costs are recomputed annually without including any percentage or rate increase over the previous year. The first formula is the base-factor method and the second the zero-base-factor method.

The pros and cons of budget formulas have been argued strongly for a number of years and the debate continues, even though several states, deciding that the disadvantages outweighed the advantages, discontinued formulas. Those who support budget formulas believe that: 1) such formulas provide an objective measure of the funding requirements of college and university programs since they do not rely on the judgments of program officers and administrators; 2) budget formulas can reduce open competition among institutions for state funds and can assure each institution of an annual operating appropriation; 3) budget formulas provide state officials with a reasonably understandable basis for determining the financial needs of higher education; and 4) budget formulas provide a balance between state control over each item in a budget and total institutional autonomy in fiscal matters.

The disadvantages of these formulas for nontraditional programs are presented in the next section of this report. It should be noted, however, that many of the disadvantages for nontraditional programs are disadvantages for traditional institutions as well.

Ways Formulas and Guidelines Restrict

State and federal funding policies restrain nontraditional programs in a variety of ways, but most of the problems with funding formulas and guidelines grow out of the assumptions on which they are based. The majority are either based on or derived from the course credit hour or the student credit hour as the fundamental unit of fund determination. Nine to fifteen credit hours equals a full-time-equivalent faculty who can be supported. Even though, in most instances, funding is based either on full-time-equivalent students or full-time-equivalent faculty, both of which utilize the credit hour as the basic unit of fund allocation.

Enough discussions of the strengths and weaknesses of the credit hour as an educational unit of measure have taken place in the past five years to warrant the conclusion that the student credit hour, while attempting to be standard currency, does not in fact mean the same thing from institution to institution, from state to state, or from undergraduate to graduate education. Even the amount of time spent by students to earn one unit of credit differs as much as nine clock hours among accredited universities. The credit hour is an uncommon denominator that has lost much of its meaning by the deviations that have taken place in its name. But in spite of the faults of the credit hour, those who try to base their funding requests on a unit more closely related to learning tend to lose their basis for entering the competition for state dollars.

The following examples of restrictive policies document some of the problems nontraditional programs face. Each of the restraints presented here was outlined by several institutions in different states across the nation.

1. Many nontraditional curricula, including competency-based designs, individualized modules, learning contracts, and external degree programs, do not use credit hours. Frequently, programs that include community service or work experiences also have no credit-hour equivalents. In half the states of the nation, these nontraditional programs are penalized because the very basis for determining budgets is not an integral part of their design. Even

those individualized programs which do use credit hours often cannot generate enough student credit hours to get funding for enough of the faculty positions necessary to teach in the self-paced program. But no other unit of measure has been established in any state to replace the credit hour. As a consequence, in states with funding formulas or guidelines, programs that do not use the traditional measure of achievement adopted by the state funding agency often are underfunded and thus denied a chance to demonstrate their full effectiveness.

2. Some formulas and guidelines forbid money allocated in one category to be used in another. This kind of inflexibility within funding guidelines can, in some instances, prevent administrators of nontraditional programs from using more efficient ways of educating. In New York, for example, paraprofessionals cannot be paid on a faculty salary line. Thus, the director of the experimental colleges at the State University of New York at Buffalo cannot pay undergraduates as peer teachers out of teaching funds because the undergraduates do not "qualify," yet peer teaching was a way to reduce costs, increase the student-faculty ratio, and produce as much learning.

3. Nontraditional programs are forced into an extra bookkeeping system by restrictive credit-hour guidelines. In addition to recording contact hours (or other faculty workload figures) and achievement units assessed from specified learning outcomes, they must devise a set of credits to report to the funding agency. This activity is not illegal, and may not be unethical in states where it is practiced, but it is confusing and wasteful to justify programs to the state on one set of criteria, to keep the administration and faculty informed on another set of criteria, and to prepare student transcripts on a third set.

4. Most funding formulas that use credit hours do so on partial enrollments. Because only fall term figures are used as the basis of support, traditional programs stand to benefit since they typically have more students in the first term. No so for some nontraditional education. External degree programs especially have found that fall produces the smallest enrollment and thus reduces the money allocated through formulas and direct state aid.

5. Using full-time-equivalent students as a basis for determining full-time faculty does not take into account the special nature of some nontraditional programs. In the external degree program at Empire State College, which enrolls large numbers of part-time students, almost as much faculty time and effort are needed to facilitate learning for a part-time student as for a

full-time student. Thus, when the part-time equivalents are added and used to determine funds for faculty, not enough dollars are generated to handle the real faculty workload.

6. In states with direct grants for private colleges (and 12 states now provide such aid for some or all undergraduate programs) almost all funds awarded are based on full-time study on campus. These restrictions eliminate external degree programs, independent study, television and correspondence programs, part-time students, and persons in prisons, retirement homes, nursing homes, and other situations that curtail travel to a campus. Because no state funds are available for part-time or off-campus study in private institutions, these schools are unable to mount many kinds of innovative programs. The tuition that would be needed to cover the cost would discourage enrollment. Thus, while direct state grants benefit full-time, on-campus nontraditional programs, they do little for less expensive, more accessible kinds of innovations and tend to educationally disenfranchise large groups of home- or prison-bound learners.

Even in public colleges, some state formulas and guidelines require on-campus full-time study. Arkansas, California, and Illinois, for example, have this requirement, although it has been contested in Illinois in recent months. Such fiscal control inhibits learning flexibility and the development of less expensive programs which may very well produce equal learning without large capital.

7. Some state formulas and direct aid provisions differentiate among levels of study within colleges and universities. In 13 states, the first two years of undergraduate study are supported at a set rate based on large lectures and high student-faculty ratios; the rate is increased for the last two undergraduate years and further increased for work at the master's and doctor's elvel. Nontraditional general education programs or other non-degree programs do not always have a high student-faculty ratio in the first two years of study. Consequently, many nontraditional programs cannot possibly generate sufficient credit hours to support the faculty needed to teach the curriculum they offer.

Bowling Green State University in Ohio, for example, provides an exciting modular general education program that features individual attention by teachers and has a low student-faculty ratio. Although the same learning occurs in 10 weeks in the individualized program that takes 15 weeks in the traditional program (which means that the University could teach 1/3 more students at less cost), the modular program cannot, because of the state formula, get enough faculty funding from the student credit hours generated in 10 weeks--even though the program would be less expensive.

Consequently, in Ohio and many other states, formulas which presume traditional methods of instruction may not be the most cost effective or educationally sound in the long run.

8. External degree programs operating regionally or nationally have great difficulty getting direct state aid or even state grants for students who are residents of those states in which the regional external degree center is located. Perhaps the best illustration of this problem is the Antioch University Without Walls, which operates many different programs internationally. Maryland residents who attend the Maryland Antioch center cannot receive state tuition grants because the program is administratively based outside the state or because they study part-time or off approved campuses. This same kind of problem prevails in other states and in other institutions. Thus, programs are penalized that cut across state boundaries to provide learning in specialized areas at reduced costs or no cost to those states.

9. By basing student aid or direct state aid on college charges, formulas often reduce the incentive to keep institutional costs down. Neither base-factor budgeting with an annual percentage increase nor zero-based budgeting have any cost effectiveness or efficiency criteria built into them in most states. The irony is that colleges which try to hold costs down are discouraged from doing so by both state and federal formulas. Berea College in Kentucky, for example, traditionally has charged no tuition and a very low room and board fee for students of limited economic means from the Appalachian region. Each student works 10 hours a week in lieu of paying tuition at Berea College. But, since state and federal aid to students is based on tuition and room and board charges, those students at Berea who would qualify for full aid at another institution get almost no assistance and the college must continue to raise hundreds of thousands of dollars from private sources to maintain the low tuition and self help program. State and federal programs, designed to support such efforts, appear to be discouraging them in this case.

10. All of the problems with funding are not limited to state formulas and guidelines. At least three serious problems have surfaced as a result of restrictive policies related to federal funding. Currently, the most widely discussed restriction has to do with the policies put forth in the Federal Register late in 1974 and again in 1975 prohibiting veterans benefits for independent study and other off-campus external degree programs. Understandably, some recent unethical activity has embarrassed a number of institutions as well as the Veterans Administration, but to restrict veterans benefits for those who choose to participate in Empire State, Minnesota Metorpolitan, Community College of Vermont, and other recognized external degree programs, or for veterans who choose independent study activities or individualized modular programs off-campus in more traditional institutions, is to throw out the baby with the bath water.

A number of institutions, including the University of Kentucky, also mentioned a problem with federal funding guidelines for work-study. These guidelines placed far too many restrictions on non-traditional learners. Work-study guidelines require students to be full time and many nontraditional programs are designed to accommodate the part-time learner who needs to work. Students who have to work and study at the same time could not easily earn enough money from work-study to remain in some nontraditional programs even if they were eligible for part-time study. Where the costs are passed on to the students in private colleges, part-time students cannot put together a large enough financial aid package to support themselves due to so many ineligibilities. Since some students cannot afford to go full time, they are eliminated from many good nontraditional learning opportunities. In a real sense, work-study disqualifies the poor older adult from many opportunities designed especially to facilitate his economic and educational development.

Finally, some institutions have had difficulty with the Department of Labor which has not clearly defined the minimum wage for persons who are both students and workers. Individuals who go to college part time and work part time at the college may not be eligible for the full minimum wage. Until this problem is clarified, institutions will not know what to pay employees who also study or students who also work.

Before the proposed solutions to these problems are discussed, it is important to note briefly what states have been doing to encourage and support nontraditional programs. In some states, usually those without funding formulas or guidelines, the very impetus for developing nontraditional programs has been at the state level, either in the legislature or state education offices. Some state agencies have all but bribed colleges and universities to develop programs that offer alternative educational avenues to the residents of the state. Iowa and Vermont are two good examples and several others could be cited. Unfortunately, all states are not equally open to nontraditional education.

Possible Solutions

A number of partial or full remedies to these funding restraints on time- and place-free, innovative educational programs have been proposed by administrators who have experienced the problems as well as by interested external parties. Although the problems tend to be shared by many programs, no single solution is likely. Some of the solutions proposed by institutions fit particular situations and would not necessarily be useful in all states. Others have not been tried by any institution, and still others depend on cooperation from state officials or legislatures. The following list begins with partial,

less appropriate solutions and concludes with recommendations for more far reaching and potentially effective measures.

1. Passing the costs on to the students is a course of action that a number of colleges--in New York and Michigan, for example--have been forced to choose. College IV of Grand Valley State College prepares and sells curriculum materials to students to help pay extra faculty and resource persons. This method of raising funds is possible because the students cannot function in College IV without curriculum materials sold to them by the institution.

Colleges without such entrepreneurial leadership simply raise their tuition for nontraditional programs. Charges as high as $60 per hour have been reported by some public institutions, which recognize that such fees virtually eliminate students from their programs and in effect dictate an early demise.

2. "Soft" money has paid start-up costs for a number of programs in recent years. Private foundations, corporations, and federal programs have awarded many grants to innovative, time- and space-free programs in the past five years. The Yellow Pages of Undergraduate Innovations documents the large number of programs, born through private philanthrophy or public grants. The presently depressed economy, however, has reduced corporate and foundation giving and brought about a significant increase in requests, according to a number of foundation executives. This situation means that nontraditional programs must compete even more fiercely for their continuation. When existence depends on the largesse of the federal government or private philanthrophy, unproven programs are not likely to survive long without other forms of support.

3. More a strategy than a solution to the problems of restrictive funding formulas, several institutions indicated that they plan to institute a program of political pressure on state legislators and federal congressmen in order to bring about some change in state and federal funding bases. Political lobbying is a dangerous enterprise for tax-exempt educational institutions. Nevertheless, public and private colleges and their supporting councils do apply political pressure as a means of securing funding or changing budget procedures to make funding more favorable within a state.

4. Some have recommended that the most appropriate solution to state and federal funding restrictions is to do away with the formulas and guidelines entirely and let every college and university program be judged on its own merit. At least eight states that once had formulas have terminated them, although there is no evidence that dropping funding formulas was in any way based on a

desire to improve allocations for nontraditional programs. Nevertheless, nontraditional programs may indeed benefit if they have strong advocates in the right courts. On the other hand, they may be eliminated altogether. In many states that never had funding guidelines, colleges and universities are single lines in an annual or biannual state budget, able to develop whatever innovative programs institutional forces will sanction and legislators will fund.

5. A large number of respondents to the survey indicated that good will has effectively substituted for technical solutions to problems presented by state funding formulas. Some program directors reported that both institutional and statewide administrative interpretation of otherwise inflexible guidelines was enough to overcome most problems that might be encountered. Sometimes, nontraditional programs that have experienced particular difficulty with state guidelines have not had strong support from the central administrations of their institutions. Some nontraditional programs, for example, have virtually no problem with funding formulas whereas others in the same state have tremendous difficulty.

A vivid illustration of the lack of administrative good will was provided by two responses to the questionnaire from a state university. By accident, one questionnaire was sent to the president's office and another to the program director of the university's experimental college. According to the program director, "if our nontraditional program were not included in the general fund other departments would be more successful because they would not have to compete with us." Such a situation, he said, "gives rise to intrainstitutional suspicion and the administration does not give us much support in these instances." That response turns out to be an understatement since the special assistant to the president returned a blank questionnaire stating that the university offers no nontraditional programs. There is no substitute for trust and good will in the educational enterprise.

6. Arbitrarily assigning credit hours to everything done in time- and place-free programs is another solution. Such action is, of course, a conceptual contradiction and results in extra bookkeeping for the institution and occasionally for the students. In competency-based programs with credit hour systems, for example, students may be certified competent but still not qualify for graduation because they have not accumulated a sufficient number of credits--a predicament that is understandably confusing to the students and the institutions. Double bookeeping has other artifical ramifications in that the registrar must keep two sets of records, reporting in credit hours to the state and in competencies or other learning outcome terms on a student's transcript. The arbitrary assignment of credit hours will not work in every

situation; nor is it necessarily appropriate, though it has become the solution of least resistance in many instances.

7. Giving a lump sum of money based on full-time-equivalent students or faculty in a program is a way of increasing the flexibility in states like New York, where the guidelines currently prohibit spending in any category except the one for which the money was assigned. This partial solution, already available in some states, offers the chance to demonstrate cost effectiveness. In Ohio, for example, funds can be generated through student credit-hour production for faculty but used for paraprofessionals and other less well-credentialled individuals who provide certain learning opportunities as well as faculty but cost considerably less. States that now practice flexible funding should, by all means, continue the activity and other states should follow. Line budgets are much less appropriate for traditional and nontraditional programs. Again, a kind of double bookkeeping is necessary since funds are received on one basis and spent on another. This practice, as with arbitrarily assigned credit hours, leads to waste and confusion but offers flexibility and is potentially cost effective.

8. Developing baseline data particularly suited to nontraditional programs is a more hopeful and appropriate solution than most of those mentioned earlier. Since most states with formulas or guidelines use a zero-base or previous-year basis for determining traditional budgets, nontraditional programs need to develop the same kind of baseline information about their costs if they are to compete successfully for funds. Colleges and universities cannot rely on the good will of funding agencies or the assumed worth of their programs, expecting legislators and state administrators to believe that all nontraditional programs warrant support simply because they exist. If time- and place-free programs are to continue to be supported, they must develop within three years after initiation data to show that they either produce more learning for the same dollars spent for traditional programs, or the same level of learning for fewer dollars.

Far too many nontraditional programs have complained about the lack of full support without making any effort to justify their existence. All programs are not effective, and some certainly do not deserve to continue. Although many analyses are underway, some supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, no sound basis for demonstrating cost effectiveness has been developed yet that could be presented to state funding agencies or boards of regents to justify the continued existence of nontraditional programs.

9. Developing a new formula based on a concept entirely different from credit hours constitutes a very hopeful alternative to traditional funding formulas or guidelines. Robert Toft of College IV, Grand Valley State, recommends developing a funding base determined

by the amount of learning added to students by the program of instruction. Thus, value-added achievement rates could become the basis for determining how much money an institution receives for educational programs. Such a concept of accountability, based on a direct assessment of the amount of learning acquired rather than on a proxy measure such as the student credit hour, is a revolutionary concept. But the value-added approach is not likely to catch on quickly because of the tremendous threat it poses to those traditional programs that do not know how much they have added to the learning of their students nor how best to acquire the information if they wanted it.

Another possible basis for a formula for funding, developed by Harold Hodgkinson and me under a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, is the Faculty Professional Task Inventory. This instrument lists all the professional behaviors in which faculty engage as part of their workload. Each task on the inventory is weighted and the number of times a faculty member performs the task is multiplied by the weight for that task to determine the total Professional Service Units for a faculty member for a term or for a year. A faculty member's load can be described more completely by Professional Service Units than by student credit hours since the units portray (separate from what students do) the total work of faculty. A teachers' Professional Service Unit can be divided into his or her salary and the cost of each task performed, or any task performed by all members of the faculty, can be calculated. This method could provide a new cost base for nontraditional programs.

10. Program budgeting, for the few states that engage in it, has not presented any major problems for nontraditional programs. While this method was not proposed as a solution by any of the institutions surveyed, program budgeting seems to be an appropriate way out of the formula dilemma. Program budgeting does not interfere with any particular kind of educational program but allows each to justify its existence and set its priorities through a budget that describes the money necessary to carry out each level of activities. Developing program budgeting for large state universities would be extremely complicated and consequently will not easily catch on as a solution to the problems of nontraditional programs in such institutions. It could, of course, be combined with other systems of fund allocation or be used exclusively as a basis for justifying innovative programs.

11. Perhaps the most far reaching possibility for solving funding restrictions comes from Norway. That country has developed the equivalent of a council for innovation which can supercede any and all traditional funding guidelines for educational programs. Using its own criteria, specially developed for legislative purposes,

the council establishes the merits of innovative programs that do not fit traditional ways of budgeting for education. This council, recently described by Norwegian educators visiting in the United States, seems to offer each state an ombudsmanlike potential for solving the funding problems of nontraditional programs.

12. Of all suggestions received from the institutions surveyed, the largest number centered on changing the formulas or guidelines themselves. Several different ideas were presented in response to the way certain states developed their formulas or guidelines. Some of the ideas may be broadly adopted while others apply to the specific situations out of which they arose.

One suggestion is to build an override into the formula system of every state. This finds support in Frank Gross's recent study of funding formulas in 25 states. Gross recommends that "provision be made in each state's formula for additional requests supported by objective and subjective data."[4] Such an override could be accommodated either by a weighted base formula for long term support, or a direct amount for a short term. Funds would be allocated for planning, program development, implementation, and the cost of determining the base line data.

Another possibility is to include a percentage for program development as a new category of funding formulas. This suggestion is similar to the override but specially designed for new program development. Similar results are also accomplished as in the override but on a sliding scale instead of through a flat amount. No public discussion of formulas has ever considered new programs as a legitimate formula category. Neither John Millet, Francis Gross nor any of the other writers who have concerned themselves with the problems of funding formulas and guidelines has mentioned the need for a category of innovative program development. Yet, considering the large number of innovative programs introduced annually in public and private education, the addition of a percentage of either the base factor or the flat amount of a funding formula for the development of nontraditional programs seems appropriate.

A third recommendation for changing formulas is to establish a full-time-equivalent student base factor, if not already established, and add a special rate for nontraditional programs. By such a device, if a base factor of $1,200 per student was allocated, depending upon the level of the program an additional ten or twenty percent rate of that base would be added for start-up costs of innovative programs.

Likewise, the base factor per full-time-equivalent student could be changed by allocating an expanded flat amount per full-

time student in a new formula category for nontraditional programs. The flat amount in traditional programs might be $1,200 for the first two years of undergraduate study and $1,500 in nontraditional programs. But this suggestion by assuming that innovative programs are always more expensive than traditional ones, is poor justification for their continuation.

A fifth alternative would use a zero-base traditional cost standard and add an increment for nontraditional programs. In all states with formulas, either base factor, zero-base factor, or full-time-equivalent student flat allocation or percentage allocation is used to determine funding. Each could easily be combined with an increment for nontraditional programs.

Another approach is to use a student-faculty contact-hour ratio instead of a credit-hour ratio for determining instructional costs, and then add a percentage for planning, development, implementation, and departmental expenses in addition to faculty salaries. Many formulas incorporate some kind of student-faculty ratio in their design. As pointed out earlier, this ratio is ordinarily based on the student credit hour but could just as well be based on the contact hour which, in modular programs and other individualized activities, would be a more meaningful measure of faculty effort. Empire State College in New York, for example, uses contact hours and designates one contract month of study as equivalent to four credit hours in a traditional system.

Another formula modification suggested is to establish a different balance in the formula ratio for nontraditional programs. In New York, for example, the traditional ratio is one full-time-equivalent faculty for every 24 full-time-equivalent undergraduates. Empire State originally was placed on a one-to-thirty ratio, which actually reduced the amount of money available for developing programs. This recommendation moves in the opposite direction, urging a lower faculty-student ratio for nontraditional programs during start-up and until they can justify their existence in a cost-effective manner.

13. The solution to problems of aid restriction to colleges for part-time or off-campus students is to change the regulation. Since these restrictions were imposed by states and the Veterans Administration to overcome misuses of state and federal funds, any change in the regulations must continue safeguards against abuses. Requiring regional accreditation for part-time or off-campus programs would still penalize some students and programs but considerably fewer than are now disenfranchised. Or, in lieu of accreditation innovative programs desiring state aid or VA benefit eligibility could be required to meet specially developed criteria similar

in concept but not content to accreditation standards. The state or federal government could then validate and certify programs for eligibility. Such criteria could and should be developed to keep from stifling some of the most promising cost-effective ways of delivering postsecondary education.

While by far the largest number of respondents to the survey indicated that the best way to fund nontraditional programs is to change the formulas, guidelines, and regulations in the states, they also were quick to point out that change of that magnitude ordinarily occurs only when the budget structure becomes intolerable to administrators of traditional collegiate programs. Nontraditional programs usually have to derive their benefits indirectly from the actions of the traditional program officers. Respondents also noted that the frequently limited bureaucratic skills of persons who generate nontraditional programs place them at a political disadvantage within their institutions. They may be at the top of the pedagogical order but at the bottom of the pecking order. Although changing budget formulas seems to be a good solution, nontraditional program directors themselves are not likely to be in a position to effect that change. They must rely on institutional administrators, state budget officers, and state directors of higher education to comprehend the problems and seek the solutions.

Problems of Approval

Funding formulas are not the only state restrictions nontraditional programs have felt. Problems of approval have been much more widespread than funding problems and are considerably more devastating since licensing establishes funding eligibility and student enrollments. Faculty workload definitions and bureaucratic violations of state law compound the problem of getting recognition for innovative postsecondary education.[5]

In one form or another state program approval has curtailed more nontraditional education than any other single regulation. The problem manifests itself in a number of ways, none consciously or maliciously aimed at nontraditional education. Many state education departments define requirements for degrees granted within their state in courses or hours to be completed. Such a practice rules out time-shortened and time-free degree programs as well as competency-based programs in which students write their own curriculum or use prior learning without acquiring credit for it. In Illinois, for example, students in time-free programs sometimes complete a Masters degree before reaching 120 hours and teacher certification.

Using courses to define programs eliminates the use of competent professionals to help a student tailor a program to a chosen career or set competencies separate from required courses. Nontraditional engineering, secretarial, and accounting programs were cited by various institutions as being confined to one experience track.

Requiring students to have 24 to 30 credits in residence is a very confining state policy for external degree programs. In fact, nearly all full-time, on-campus requirements adversely affect nontraditional education.

In some states it is quite difficult to get a license to offer a less traditional subject like filmmaking, and in many states nontraditional subjects in secondary teacher education cannot get approved because they do not meet preset criteria. Even guidance and counseling has been rejected. In other states, even though all criteria are met, nontraditional programs seem to be denied approval because of the extreme conservativism of state nursing boards, public accounting boards, and education departments.

On the other hand, programs in some states have almost no trouble getting approval. Boards in these states are eager for innovative programs to develop and give very strong support and encouragement. That 17 state education departments have urged competency curricula for teacher education partially reflects this support, although nontraditional competency programs of teacher education cannot get approval in some states that have mandated it. Generally the supportive states have no funding guidelines for higher education programs and have to generate interest in expanding pedagogical horizons.

Some other approval rules interfere with external degree programs in states with very specific criteria. In a few states, for example, programs without "proper" libraries cannot be licensed. In others private colleges or extensions cannot get contracts to serve students in that state (and thus receive student or direct aid) unless they affiliate with a public institution. Although these restrictive technicalities are rare, bureaucratic jealousy and territorial protection are not. Responsible program officers have reported an alarming number of overt or covert violations of state laws by state administrators who, for personal or territorial reasons, wanted to keep new programs "out." Granat's study fully documents this problem.

State approval has not been the only other problem for nontraditional programs. Definition of faculty frequently has limited the personnel available to teach effectively in innovative programs.

Some states, for example, have overload limits and minimum contact hours which sharply curtail distributions of faculty time in other kinds of teaching activity. In other situations state guidelines give no "credit" for certain faculty tasks. If the full-time equivalence is based on teaching 12 hours, for example, and faculty in an external degree program teach six hours and help 50 students write learning contracts they are still counted only as half time. Such systems discourage hard work and the desire or ability to innovate.

In recent months labor unions representing faculty have also begun to impinge upon nontraditional programming. In states with faculty bargaining units, all faculty are represented and required to function within negotiated contracts. These agreements are based on "normal" behavior at traditional universities but tend to have an adverse effect on nontraditional faculty roles in much the same way that state approval policies have affected workload.

Perhaps the greatest evidence of state restrictions on nontraditional education is the total lack of programs in law, medicine, and certain other professional disciplines. Programs are not even attempted in these fields because neither the programs nor the students who participated would be licensed. Even if programs were approved, students could not transfer. Because such programs are never tried, state officials and educators have not been blamed for squelching them. Nevertheless, time- and place-free programs have developed in every field that has been open, and the void of programs in certain areas speaks for itself.

Those programs such as Antioch's University Without Walls and Nova University, which function in many states at the same time, have approval problems compounded. Fred Nelson, administrative vice president of Nova, a national external degree graduate university, said recently:

> The greatest single barrier to the development of any national educational program, whether graduate, professional or even undergraduate, is state-by-state differences of control and the political realities of state-by-state licensing requirements.

Some of these institutions have been forced to file suit or to modify their program radically in order to operate in certain states.

As with funding problems, the most difficult federal agency has been the Veterans Administration. Competency evaluations and

written statements in lieu of grades have not been accepted by the VA, causing veterans to retreat to safer programs with traditional grades. Over 40 institutions mentioned difficulties of one kind or another with VA policies or interpretations of policies, all of which had the effect of eliminating veterans from the programs or forcing compromises in program design.

Thus, state and federal policies do affect the kind of programs that can be developed, when and where they can function, who may attend, when and for how long. No one can say that restrictions should be eliminated altogether from higher education but neither should they be administered absolutely and arbitrarily alike for all programs without more serious consideration of the price of consistency. Flexible policies evenly administered could include most existing nontraditional programs, helping them become more effective alternatives to the traditional forms of postsecondary education.

Conclusions

Clearly state formulas and guidelines and some federal funding policies are too restrictive and inflexible to allow nontraditional programs to function effectively. The formulas or guidelines currently used by 33 states offer no incentive to be cost effective since the basis for budgeting is last year's or this year's actual costs. Some formulas, designed to improve accountability, to increase fairness in programming, and to provide resources for the most effective programs within a state, have become a mechanism for defeating those very aims. Thus, the irony of budget formulas is that they may work against the purposes they were designed to serve. This contradiction results when formulas fail to be flexible enough to take into account the developmental costs of nontraditional programs, when they fail to require that innovative as well as traditional programs be based on more cost-effective concepts than last year's expenditures, and when colleges that do not pass their costs along to students are financially penalized because support is based on those charges.

While innovative time- and place-free programs must be cost effective to compete in the marketplace of higher education, they must also be given sufficient funding to develop the skills, assessment instruments, teaching-learning techniques, and administrative strategies necessary to reduce costs or increase learning achievement. Start-up costs, operating parallel nontraditional and traditional programs, and research, much of which still must be trial and error on new ways of delivering education, are all expensive. If budgeting formulas and guidelines cannot provide

for these initial costs by some legitimate means, then the possibility of developing meaningful alternatives to traditional educational structures are greatly diminished.

Those states that design budget formulas and guidelines are justifiably concerned about being accountable to their people, but by failing to build in provisions that allow developing programs the years and support they need in order to justify themselves on any cost effective basis, states hamper their own long-term educational efficiency and lock themselves into the continually inflating costs of traditional programs. By supporting the development of sound educational alternatives which someday, hopefully will prove to be considerably less expensive and more effective, governments can be more accountable to the people of this nation than they have in the past. Only by a concerted action of educators, administrators, state budget officers, legislative committees, federal program officers, and chief higher educational officers in every state can some satisfactory solutions to restrictive state and federal funding guidelines for nontraditional programs be established.

Session II - Case Study 1

Valhalla is a medium-sized western state with a growing population. There is well-developed industry and a heavy reliance on tourist trade. The state university system (six universities) is continuing to gain students. The 1974-75 increase was nine per cent above that of 1973-74.

Unfortunately, because of an unforeseen downturn in the state economy, the total budget for the university system has been cut four per cent. Therefore, the Board of Control has enacted several mandates that directly affect the universities:

1. Any faculty member who resigns, retires, or otherwise leaves his position will not be replaced; the faculty line will be lost to the department.

2. The teaching load of each faculty member will be increased to 15 hours per quarter.

3. The class size will be increased to accommodate the fewer number of instructors.

4. Common course numbering must be put into effect at all state universities in September of 1976.

5. The largest university has an excellent, but small Ph.D. program in Social Psychology. One or two students per year have been graduated. The Board of Control has recommended the program be dropped. This is the only Social Psychology program in the state.

Basis for Discussion

You are responsible for evaluating these recommendations and suggesting other courses of action to the Board of Control.

Session II - Case Study 2

The legislature has just passed a law limiting funds which will be allocated to postsecondary education. The proposed funding level is equal to that of 1972 (in real dollars). If the proposal becomes law, it will be necessary to scale down or eliminate selected program offerings.

The Chancellor's staff has performed an individual course load matrix* analysis for this and other studies of the entire post-secondary system. The impact of program cuts can be seen clearly. You have the responsibility of recommending an appropriate course of action to the governor and legislative leaders.

Your choices follow:

1. Enrollment caps for all institutions of higher education;

2. Funding limitations set by the legislature which will induce effectually an enrollment cap;

3. Elimination of specific programs: foreign language, nursing, and so forth;

4. Elimination of the first two years of undergraduate education at all four year and graduate institutions with the enrollment absorbed by the community junior colleges and private institutions;

5. Elimination of community junior colleges with enrollments absorbed by the four year, graduate, and private institutions.

6. Other _____

*An induced course load matrix is the distribution of individual students outside their major area.

References

1. K. Patricia Cross, John Valley and Associates, Planning Non-Traditional Programs: An Analysis of the Issues for Post-Secondary Education, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1974, p. 380.

2. Francis McK. Gross. "A Comparative Analysis of the Existing Budget Formulas Used for Justifying Budget Requests or Allocating Funds for the Operating Expenses of State Supported Colleges and Universities." Unpublished dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1973, p. iv.

3. Ibid., p. v.

4. Ibid., p. vi.

5. The issue of approval is treated here only briefly. For a more complete assessment, see Richard Granat's study for the National Institute of Education on Legal Policy Constraints to the Development of External Degree Programs, January, 1975. ERIC report number HE006323.

SESSION III

ACCOUNTABILITY, CONFLICT, AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Larry L. Leslie

As you know, I have been asked to discuss with you the topic of accountability and conflict in postsecondary education. That such a topic would be assigned, suggests to me that a problem or potential problem exists in regard to accountability between the institutions and the state coordinating boards. And incidentally, in my discussion, I will use the terms state coordinating boards, state boards or simply boards in the generic sense to refer to governing boards, voluntary and compulsory coordinating boards and planning agencies. Of course, there is a problem or at least a potential problem, and we all know it.

We may not all know, however, precisely why the problem or conflict, or perhaps I should say potential conflict, between institutions and boards exists. Shedding some light on that subject will be one of my purposes here this morning.

Further, it is even less likely that we all know how to solve this problem. I suppose some would say there is no solution, and in an absolute, as opposed to a relative sense, I would say they are correct. Nevertheless, there clearly are things that can be done to reduce this perhaps inherent conflict between boards and institutions. And I take this to be my second purpose here today.

Let me begin then by outlining the course my discussion will take. I will begin by discussing the causes and nature of the inherent conflict between state coordinating bodies and institutions of post-secondary education. In so doing, I will make mention of the missions and goals of each sector. I will introduce some perspectives, the understanding of which should serve as a base for a much more positive relationship between state agencies and institutions. This will be a somewhat abstract, though I think intriguing, discussion focusing upon questions of values and how those values are translated into board and institutional purposes. Then, third, we will get down to particulars. Here I will try to point out some specific do's and don't's. In other words, I will attempt to be concrete. I will try to suggest how positive strategies for state planning and coordination flow naturally from steps 1 and 2: That is, how an understanding and appreciation for the inherent conflict between boards and institutions, and an understanding and appreciation for the underlying values of both organizations

Dr. Leslie is Professor of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University.

lead to specific positive actions. I think it will be seen that the actions of state boards can be guided by a clear set of principles about which most, if not all of us, can agree.

So on to step 1. Is there really an inherent conflict between state boards and postsecondary institutions? If so, why does it exist? Why is it important to understand this conflict?

Let me begin with the last question. It is my hope and belief that an understanding of the basic conflict between boards and institutions will lead to greater tolerance for and understanding of the behaviors and attitudes of each party. Further, it is my conviction that such understanding will clearly point the way to the specific actions each organization can and should take vis-a-vis the other.

Now to the inherent causes of the conflict. The simple, basic fact is that state coordinating boards and postsecondary institutions both have legitimate claims on many of the same or similar postsecondary powers. By power I mean the ability to exert one's will on another. Note I said legitimate claims. In a considerable number of cases, state agencies and separate institutions alike have been granted at least implicit and in some cases explicit powers to act in the same areas. Some times these powers or the exercise of these powers--authority--have been awarded legally through legislation, state constitutions and institutional charters; or quasi-legally through delegated powers, administrative codes and executive orders. Sometimes these powers, though they are exercised, have not been awarded at all, but are assumed by accident or by default. Such was the case in Illinois, where the higher education budget recommendations of the coordinating board came to be accepted almost verbatim by state government and, incidentally, as a result the institutions learned to act accordingly. Or in other states, such as New Mexico and Ohio where boards have used the power of budget review to induce desired actions on the parts of institutions.

Allow me to give just one complete example. At the Penn State Center, our recent study of postsecondary policy formation for the Governor's Commission in Maryland turned up a number of cases of overlapping and competing powers. Most of this overlapping occurred among the agencies of the state government, such as among the Department of Budget and State Planning, the various State Boards for each Postsecondary Sector and the Maryland Council for Higher Education, but there existed also great overlap or conflict between the powers of the state agencies and the separate institutions. The most notable case would be that concerning the Maryland Council for Higher Education--the State Postsecondary Coordinating body--and the University of Maryland. To be specific, the "Autonomy Act," as it is known in Maryland, an act of the legislature, begins as follows:

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, the Board of Regents shall exercise with reference to the University of Maryland, and with reference to every department of same, all the powers, rights, and privileges that go with the responsibility of management, including the power to conduct or maintain such departments or schools in said university and in such localities as they from time to time may deem wise; by any other State board, bureau, department or commission, in the management of the University's affairs, with the following exceptions:

The exceptions have to do with such matters as state auditing, deposit of University income in the State Treasury and submission of the budget to the state for the purpose of gaining appropriations.

But now what does the legislation establishing the Maryland Council say? Under Duties and Functions one finds the following:

(1) Prepare programs for the orderly growth and overall development of the State system of public higher education to meet trends in population and the changing social and technical requirements of the economy;

(2) Investigate and evaluate the needs throughout the State for undergraduate, graduate and adult education for professional and technical training and for research facilities, and present plans and recommendations for the establishment and location of new facilities and programs or for major alterations in existing programs or facilities;

(3) Recommend all new degree programs at the Doctoral, Master's, Baccalaureate, and Associate levels in all public institutions;

Now the point I wish to make is not that it is impossible to reconcile these two statutes--though I would hate to try--but it is to show how reasonable persons of good will might legitimately differ as to who has the power to do what. It should be noted that situations similar to this exist in many states. Can there be any wonder why conflict occurs?

In sum of this first of my three parts, there is an inherent conflict between state coordinating agencies and postsecondary institutions, and the views of both sides are legitimate. They are legitimate not only for rational, forensic reasons, but also for legal and quasi-legal reasons. In some, if not in most areas, both sides can claim the authority to act, and they can do so without overstepping their legal bounds. This realization should lead both parties to a more conciliatory attitude toward the other.

The second part of my outline had to do with the imparting to you of certain perspectives or values. Again, my purpose is not to argue the superiority of any position or set of values over any other but it is rather to increase your awareness of the legitimacy of both state

agency and institutional views. This brand of legitimacy, however, is rational rather than legal or quasi-legal. It necessitates your acceptance of the merit of certain values that seem to guide board and institutional spokesmen as they believe vis-a-vis the other. In other words, it requires your acceptance of a set of assumptions concerning the worthiness of certain values, attitudes, perspectives, concerning the nature and purpose of postsecondary education in the United States, specifically, and in Western Civilization, generally. But you should be forewarned that if you accept the legitimacy of these values, you may necessarily, according to the rules of fair play, have to alter your views concerning the appropriate relationship between state coordinating boards and postsecondary institutions.

The first recognition that I want to force you to is that ultimately all decisions regarding state-institutional relations are value laden. As Abraham Maslow put it, "all the social sciences are value laden; unlike the physical sciences, they are not value free."

This is a fact that is difficult for most of us, who pride ourselves in our esoteric knowledge, rationality and good judgement, to recognize. Maslow is right, of course; in the end all decisions in the social sciences are value based. But we seldom approach decision making with this point clearly in mind. Rather, in order to defend our position, we construct complex arguments, often having beautiful internal consistency, and being based upon neat compilations of facts and figures, without any thought to questioning the underlying assumptions or values of those positions. Let me clarify this point by example.

About three years ago, I served on an advisory panel of the Committee for Economic Development for the purpose of advising the Trustees on that now famous policy statement, or infamous, depending upon your values, The Management and Financing of Colleges. You will remember that it was this document that called for public college tuitions to be raised to 50% of instructional costs. Well, the controversy this project engendered was unbelievable--both within the CED during the period of the formulation of the document, and afterwards inside and outside the CED. The point that became totally clear only much later was that the reason a consensus on financing policy could not be achieved had nothing at all to do with the cogency of the arguments. The simple fact was that the values of the parties to the conflict differed. Some of us held the view that the financing policies of higher education must serve all its various purposes, while for others the priority if not single goal was income redistribution in the larger society through equality of educational opportunity. And we could never agree with each others' beautifully constructed arguments because we did not accept the premises. To this day, the strong differences remain; if anything the chasm between the factions is wider than ever.

Well, what are the competing values in regard to statewide coordination and accountability? On the state agency side, I would say that the values basic to the establishment and maintenance of these bodies are essentially two: the efficient use of resources and the promotion of institutional responsiveness. Perhaps these two values could be summarized in one work: accountability.

I need not recapitulate, for a group such as this, the iniquitous statistics showing the tremendous growth of postsecondary education during what is now referred to as the "golden years" of higher education. During this period almost any institution could start up almost any new program or even any new campus, with relatively few questions being raised by the public's representatives. So long as there were more students than places it was unlikely that resources would be wasted no matter how or where they were spent. Each new program offered or new campus begun was filled almost immediately with willing students. The economy of scale principle was an assumed fact. Only in a relatively small number of states was serious concern given to where the system was going and what form it would eventually take. Postsecondary education was being largely responsive to the public need of educating the great masses of children of the rising middle class.

The explanation for this nobless oblige attitude on the part of the public and their representatives, however, involved more than the mere demonstration of need for more and better postsecondary facilities and resources. Equally important was the priority mandate given to postsecondary education. In short, there were relatively few forces competing as priorities for public monies. The Korean War was recently behind us, and national defense could be relegated to lower priority. Further, "The Great Society" was not yet upon us and thus there was not yet the great pressure that would soon emerge for public dollars to meet domestic social needs. Yet, the Nation was prospering. The precipitous rise in the GNP and in disposable income meant that federal, state and individual and family dollars for postsecondary education were available in amounts seldom equaled.

At the dawning of a new decade in 1970, when most of us involved in postsecondary education were still conducting business as usual, a few scattered voices were telling us that conditions someday would change. Only a year or two later we awakened to find that the balloon had already burst. Higher education was no longer public priority number one. Enter the era of strongly mandated state coordination and control of institutions of postsecondary education.

Postsecondary education had, almost without notice by many academics, gradually become a lower public priority. Greatly increased expenditure for the Vietnam War and especially for public transfer payments had greatly reduced the public priority for post-

secondary education. Further, the job of educating the masses was seen by many as a mission accomplished, as millions of new students filled the college campuses.

The legitimate public concern was for postsecondary accountability in the expenditure of public resources and in the nature of the products those resources were buying. In short, the public was demanding efficiency and a new responsiveness on the part of postsecondary education. "Unnecessary duplication" would no longer be tolerated; nor would the self indulgences of effete faculties. The futuristic disclosure that postsecondary institutions would someday be graduating more students than society could put to productive use added to the public clamor; but the fact that finally and completely signaled the end of an era has been the realization during the past year or two that college graduates have in fact been eventually going without jobs.

Set against these values of efficiency and responsiveness, or accountability--values that are the legitimate underpinnings of statewide coordination--are the sometimes conflicting traditional values of colleges and universities. Many lists of such values, manifested in the form of institutional purposes, have been composed over the centuries, but most closely resemble that composed by the Carnegie Commission in 1973. The Commission's list consists of the following:

1. the provision of opportunities for the intellectual, aesthetic, ethical, and skill development of individual students, and the provision of campus environments which can constructively assist students in their more general development and growth;

2. the advancement of human capability in society at large;

3. the enlargement of educational justice for the postsecondary age group;

4. the transmission and advancement of learning and wisdom;

5. the critical evaluation of society--through individual thought and persuasion--for the sake of society's self-renewal.

That these two sets of values--state agency and institutional--are inherently conflicting should require little elaboration. On the one hand, statewide coordinating bodies demand--legitimately--that institutions be more responsive or accountable to the needs of society. On the other hand--and equally legitimately--the institutions insist that they must be left alone if they are to satisfy such purposes as the critical evaluation of society and the transmission and advancement of learning and wisdom.

The protections institutions insist they need can be summarized under two concepts: academic freedom and institutional autonomy. Academic freedom speaks most clearly to the fifth of the five Carnegie Commission purposes of postsecondary education: the critical evaluation of society. Presumably, I do not need to recount, for this audience, the critical role academic freedom has played throughout history in prodding the conscience of the larger society. This social conscience has been expressed when few voices outside colleges and universities were being heard, indeed when sociey almost demanded that such voices not be heard. That the germination of opposition to McCarthyism, racism, and the Vietnam War occurred within postsecondary institutions was, in my view, no chance event. This was a task society had assigned to colleges and universities and specific safeguards had been instituted in order to insure that this and certain other tasks be performed.

Institutional autonomy for the protection of academic freedom and the satisfaction of the other manifest values, or institutional purposes, was the ultimate goal of these safeguards. Institutional charters had in some cases guaranteed the freedom of private institutions from state interference. I am sure we all recall the substance of the Dartmouth College Case. In other instances actions had been taken to insure the independence of public institutions. The Autonomy Act in Maryland, already cited, would be one such action. In an even clearer illustration, it is significant to note that the drafters of several state constitutions deemed it necessary to exceed the protective shelter of legislative statutes and to assure the independence of their major public universities through constitutional guarantees. Minnesota, Michigan and California are three examples. The perceived need for these guarantees is aptly stated in a Supreme Court opinion of some years ago.

> No field of education is so thoroughly comprehended by man that new discoveries cannot yet be made. This is particularly true in the social sciences, where few, if any, principles are accepted as absolutes. Scholarship cannot flourish in an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die.

Obviously, academic freedom is not easily separated from institutional autonomy. Whereas the former is defined as the free market in ideas, institutional autonomy is defined as the power of a university or college to govern itself. Historically, the assurance of academic freedom has been found in institutional autonomy. Yet, academic freedom must be separated from institutional autonomy because in times of increasing state coordination and control some institutional autonomy clearly must be conceded to the state in the interests of the efficiency and responsiveness values. But it is not

possible to sacrifice any academic freedom. To lose some is to lose all. There is no such thing as some academic freedom any more than there is such a thing as some freedom of speech or some freedom of the press. Further, although some institutional autonomy must be given up, all cannot be. If all institutional autonomy is lost, academic freedom must ultimately be lost either directly or indirectly through state inducements or coercions. I think the same is true for some other goals. One would be goal related to research.

The assertion is that few nonacademics both understand and appreciate and thus will defend adequately, the academic freedom or social critic value; nor have they internalized most of the other higher education values. As Robert Berdahl puts it, "No one who does not love a university should be allowed to tamper with it." I have been known to say that I wonder if there are not more laymen who can judge the professional acts of physicians than there are those who can judge the acts of universities. This arrogant statement is based upon observations that have noted how very few laymen seem to understand or even be aware of all the five purposes of postsecondary education. It would seem self-evident that all five values or purposes must be nurtured, along with efficiency and responsiveness, if statewide coordinating bodies and institutions are to do their jobs.

In summary of this second part of my outline, I have attempted to impart to you two legitimate sets of values: those of state agencies and those of institutions. I have shown implicitly that these values are potentially, though not necessarily, in conflict. More responsive institutions must be sought along with the preservation of certain institutional values, the realization of which may rely in large part upon a certain degree of institutional autonomy. A delicate balance is what we seek, and it will not be achieved easily. In the words of John Gardner:

> The issues of university autonomy will never finally be solved. It can only be lived with.

Finally, then, we are at point three in my outline, where I promised to be specific on the subject of the proper relationships between state boards and institutions. Since the context of this paper is accountability, I will begin this third part with a definitional discussion of the concept. This will be useful in pointing out the existing forms accountability will take and the mechanisms available in properly and improperly holding institutions accountable. The remainder, and bulk, of this third part will itemize and discuss proper and improper actions of boards vis-a-vis institutions and vice versa.

If you had a chance to read the ERIC-AAHE monograph, "Accountability in Higher Education," by my good friend and colleague, Ken Mortimer, you are aware that there exists several forms of views of accountability in postsecondary education. All forms have some, though

I would submit, a widely varying relationship to or bearing on accountability at the state level.

There is, first of all, accountability as evaluation. Rodney Hartnett at ETS has articulated this position most clearly. According to Hartnett:

> The concept of accountability as set forth by those who would establish accountability systems in higher education focuses on the question of how much change the college produces in its students and how these changes compare with those brought about by other colleges.

In other words, the evaluator's view of accountability is rooted deeply in the "value added" concept: Given the "condition" of the "input" and the eventual "condition" of the "output" how much value has been added and how much of it can be attributed to the post-secondary experience?

This brand of accountability is not yet commonly used by state coordinating boards; nor in my view should it be. The technology is not yet adequate to the task. Further, this view of accountability is too narrow.

The evaluation strategies currently being used by state boards are based upon a somewhat different view of accountability. The typical accountability question being asked by state boards, is, for example, How much does it cost to produce one baccalaureate degree? This view considers that accountability includes considerations of efficiency, or costs per unit of output, in addition to effectiveness--the degree to which goals are accomplished. In other words, the question is not only how many students are being served, but what is the cost? Second, this view considers that accountability implies external appraisal whereas evaluation involves only internal judgments. Accountability is something somebody does to you, not something you do to yourself. Thirdly, and most importantly, accountability focuses on outputs. Inputs, e.g., the "quality" of freshmen, are largely irrelevant.

This is a legitimate question for state boards to ask. But the sequel--How does this cost compare to costs at comparable institutions--is less legitimate: The problem with this question is that comparable institutions rarely, if ever, exist.

I do not have the time nor am I prepared to defend fully this assertion here, but the most critical point to be made is that instructional missions are rarely comparable. Further, even when missions are similar, local conditions and institutional emphases, which affect costs, vary sufficiently to make comparisons largely

dysfunctional. Perhaps you will find it an adequate defense of the assertion to note that both WICHE, the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, and the National Commission on the Finance of Postsecondary Education--two organizations at the outset very favorably inclined to accomplish the task--largely aborted efforts to construct valid comparative measures, at least temporarily.

The second common usage of accountability identified by Dr. Mortimer is that which is more properly defined as responsibility. This kind of accountability again is not the proper domain of state coordinating boards because it involves individual freedoms. Whereas accountability is enforceable because it involves legal or formal liability on the part of individuals, responsibility is a voluntary obligation. The organization must decide either collectively or otherwise for which behaviors it will hold its citizens accountable--but the individual has the freedom, in a democracy, to decide which obligations he or she will assume--or be responsible for. This kind of accountability is a kind of personal activity that is primarily voluntary rather than compulsory--the latter being a critical component of the definition of accountability in Mortimer's view.

In an article in the June 1971 issue of the Journal of Higher Education, T. R. McConnell lists the different ways in which faculty members are held accountable: (p. 453)

> First a faculty member is accountable to his own conscience and especially to his own standards of scholarhsip and intellectual integrity. Second, faculty members are held accountable in a variety of ways to their students. Presumably, they are answerable for the effectiveness of their teaching, for fair and unprejudiced evaluation of student academic accomplishments and for maintenance of freedom and expression in the classroom. Third, faculty are also accountable to their peers. Sometimes they are answerable only informally as when other scholars appraise their research. Sometimes they are formally accountable as is the case when a faculty committee evaluates the individual's performance as a basis for appointment, promotion, tenure or nonreappointment.

A good deal of what McConnell classified as accountability, Mortimer would classify as responsibility. Yet, these are faculty activities that boards are coming to place under the rubric of accountability rather than responsibility. The increased formalization of standards of accountability towards faculty is reflected in such legislated standards as the Snyder amendment in Pennsylvania, legislated faculty workload standards that have been developed or attempted in several states (Michigan and Florida) and the increased formalization of standards of professional ethics. As I think will be seen in my discussion of the next kind of accountability, these are not legitimate actions to be taken by state governments or their agents.

The third and most extensive kind of accountability, and the kind that would appear to be most applicable to our discussion, is what Mortimer labels "managerial accountability." Managerial accountability refers to those aspects of the organization which deal with the concept of control. The optimum control situation for maximum organizational accountability is one in which rewards and sanctions are distributed so that those whose performance deviates from the plan will be punished. Now, finally, we are ready to discuss the forms that state accountability vis-a-vis postsecondary institutions should take. Holding organizations and their actors accountable for performance is one of the prime purposes of managerial control. As I have said, state accountability mechanisms, if properly conceived, are legitimate. As Bob Berdahl puts it (p. 9):

> The real issue with respect to autonomy is not whether there will be interference by the state but rather whether the inevitable interference will be confined to the proper topics and expressed through a suitably sensitive mechanism.

Berdahl, who strikes me as one who has carefully worked out the proper balance between institutional and state board values and who bases his recommendations upon a thorough knowledge of the proper functionings of both organiztions, makes the following two generalizations:

1. Most state procedural controls are more a hindrance to good higher education than they are a necessary safeguard of the public interest (p. 10).

   Berdahl reminds us that modern theories of administration hold that administrators should be granted maximum powers to implement policies and then be held accountable for results (p. 11). As proper procedural concerns of state agencies, he singles out such matters as post audits; the establishment of common budget categories and common instructional and productivity definitions (e.g., F.T.E.'s and student/faculty ratios); and standard measures of space utilization (pp. 10-11). He excludes from this list such procedural matters as tight state control of transfers among budget line-items, preaudits of authorized expenditures, centralized control over all nonacademic personnel, central control of capital outlay programs, central purchasing of supplies and equipment and central control of various administrative matters such as approval of out-of-state travel.

2. On substantive as opposed to procedural matters, Berdahl sees a more vital role for state coordinating bodies. Clearly, statewide planning, to include such items as the approval of new programs broadly defined, is one legitimate task of state boards.

Another substantive matter in which there is clearly a legitimate state role is budget consolidation and general review although the latter is perhaps the area most fraught with the potential for abuse of institutional purposes and values. It appears clear that where state boards have overstepped their proper bounds, they have done so by exercising their power of budgetary review. Boards must be made more self-conscious of how their actions in this area can, sometimes inadvertently, result in improper intrusions into the internal affairs of institutions.

Perhaps the best list of the proper tasks of state boards and of institutions was composed by the Carnegie Commission for its report, The Capitol and the Campus. First - for the states: the

1. Number of places available in state institutions as a total and in specific programs where there are clear manpower needs (e.g., medicine).

2. Number and location of new campuses.

3. Minimum and maximum size of institutions by type.

4. General admissions policy (i.e., whether open door or selective).

5. General level of institutional budgets, including construction budgets.

6. General level of salaries.

7. Accounting practices.

8. General functions of institutions.

9. Major new endeavors.

10. Effective use of resources.

11. Continued effective operation of the institutions within the general law.

But said Carnegie, the states should be restrained in the following ways:

- External budget control should be limited to the total amount of the budget and to post-audit for purposes of determining fiscal responsibility and should not involve line-item approval, involvement in budget management, or specific allocation of resources within the institution.

- Salary scales for individual classifications should not be set by external authority, nor should mix of faculty or staff at various levels be determined by external authority.

- General levels of admission may be determined externally, but external authorities should not be involved in the application of a policy to meet those levels or in the application of admission policies to individual cases.

- The hiring, firing and assignment of faculty and staff should be within the internal control of the institutions.

- While space utilization standards and maximum costs per square foot are legitimately a matter of external policy, building and equipment design should not be.

For the institution, the Carnegie list included:

1. The appointment and promotion of faculty members of administrators.

2. Determination of courses of instruction and content of courses.

3. Selection of individual students.

4. Awarding of individual degrees.

5. Selection and conduct of individual research projects, and freedom to publish and otherwise disseminate research results.

6. Freedom of inquiry.

7. Freedom of speech, assembly, and other constitutional freedoms so central to the educational process.

In this final part of my discussion, I have sought to lay out the proper areas of power and authority for the states and for the institution. The points of demarcation are seldom clear or universally applicable. Inter- and intra-state differences are often far too great. Yet, I believe that these distributions of power and authority between state boards and the institutions are for the most part consistent with the roles society has assigned to and wishes each to serve. If institutions are to continue to serve the societal values they represent and if state coordinating bodies are to do likewise, accommodations such as these must ultimately be reached between representatives of boards and of the institutions.

References

1. Berdahl, R. O. Statewide Coordination of Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

2. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Capitol and the Campus: State Responsibility for Postsecondary Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

3. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Purposes and the Performance of Higher Education in the United States: Approaching the Year 2000. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

4. McConnell, T. R. "Accountability and Autonomy." Journal of Higher Education, 1971, 42, 446-463.

5. Mortimer, K. P. "Accountability in Higher Education." ERIC-AAHE Monograph No. 1, Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1972.

Session III - Case Study

Your state legislature has implemented a public employee collective bargaining statute. As public employees, postsecondary faculty throughout the state have organized into a bargaining unit which will negotiate directly with the Postsecondary Board of Regents. The Board must formulate management's position. Historically, academic freedom has been the cornerstone of faculty/management relations. The Board wishes to retain and enhance this relationship. The following proposals have been made by the staff of the House Education Committee:

1. A minimum of 15 contact hours per faculty member per term;

2. A student-teacher ratio of 25 to 1 for undergraduate and 10 to 1 for graduate;

3. A tenure quota system which limits the total number of tenured faculty for the entire state to no more than 60 per cent of full time faculty.

Basis for Discussion

Your task as the Board of Regents staff is to evaluate each recommendation with particular attention given to its impact on faculty academic freedom vis-a-vis accountability. Prepare your position statement for the next Board meeting.

LUNCHEON SESSION

NEW ASSUMPTIONS FOR STATE LEVEL LEADERSHIP IN THE FUTURE

Robert B. Mautz

For most of their history state supported universities were autonomous. In their external political relations, for example, they dealt directly with the legislature. Presidents urged adoption of requests for funds to sympathetic legislators. The resulting appropriations determined policy, the location and size of a building, the inauguration or expansion of academic programs, and the competitive relationship of each institution both within and without the state. The affairs of state government were relatively few. Legislatures met infrequently, budgets were small, and decisions, although significant, were relatively easy to make. Alternatives were clear and choices were few.

In the decade following World War II the web became more complex. The state assumed a larger role in our daily lives as the span of its concerns widened. Increasingly, the government regulated, subsidized, controlled, policed and concerned itself with the welfare of the citizens. It assumed responsibility for the aged, the indigent, the physically and mentally ill. Populations grew exponentially. The clamor for free or low cost quality education was extended downward to kindergarten and upward through graduate school. Our society increasingly depended upon a technological base which demanded a high level of education and extensive research capabilities. Universities expanded and multiplied. Teacher colleges became universities. Graduate programs proliferated.

As state budgets became larger in response to new and more substantial demands, the old ways of determining the allocation of money were rendered outmoded and inadequate. State legislatures sought improved ways of conceptualizing and addressing the increasingly controversial questions with which they were confronted. They sought to deal broadly with the questions of allocation of additional support among categories such as mental health, roads and education. Within the latter category, the capped and graduate and research programs became the focus of decisions. No longer could the legislature deal with the welter of conflicting data and frequently inconsistent claims presented by a larger number of individual and ambitious universities. The division of money as between universities became buried in larger questions. Increasingly, political rather than

Dr. Mautz is Chancellor, the Florida State University System, and will assume a Regents' Professorship at the University of Florida in September, 1975.

educational considerations governed hasty and often uninformed decisions with respect to the division of monies among the plethora of university petitioners. Planning to accommodate the future was uncoordinated, parochial or non-existent.

The response of the states was to lodge responsibility for the planning and coordination of universities in a single agency. The legislature was thereby enabled to deal with the broader conceptual questions as to the division of resources between public education and higher education and allocate the proper percentage of the state revenue to each of these functions according to its judgement. Boards were given authority to recommend the establishment of new institutions, the expansion of existing ones, and to plan for the distribution of students and programs among the institutions as well as the location and size of facilities to house them. The outcome of the struggle between those who feared encroachment by such boards upon traditional institutional autonomy and those who believed in the necessity for such unification resulted in state boards which vary in terms of the duties and responsibilities allocated to them. Such boards range from coordinating bodies possessing recommending authority only, to a single governing board controlling a consolidated budget for all publicly supported universities. Since mid 1950, however, the trend has been clear and unmistakable, states without such central authorities established them--those with central boards strengthened their powers. At the present time, forty-seven states have central boards as contrasted with seventeen in 1954.

On the whole, such boards have performed well under difficult circumstances Much was expected and much was demanded of them. For a number of reasons, many of them failed to live up to those expectations. That they failed to meet these high expectations and the extraordinary demands does not indict them. The comment that they, on the whole, performed satisfactorily in the light of reasonable expectations and the political situation in which they found themselves remains in my opinion a valid judgement.

And what of the future?

I foresee a number of factors in the next ten years which will present problems requiring consummate wisdom and judgement. The handling of these issues will determine whether such boards continue with expanded responsibilities or whether fragmentation of our higher education structure occurs. Those major forces impacting operations can be grouped under two large subject matter areas although they overlap and affect each other. The first of these is the straightened fiscal outlook. The second is the prospective rapid decrease in the size of the traditional college bound student pool. Time will permit me to deal with these only in rough outline. I raise them in order that you may consider and refine them.

Fiscal Situation -- From 1950 to the mid 1960's, the real income of universities increased rapidly and dramatically. You are familiar with the figures in the Carnegie Commission study which have indicated that expenditures of universities grew at a rate more rapid than the growth of the gross national product. The unit cost of instruction increased. Large annual increments of manpower and funds were dedicated to research. Teaching loads were lowered. The average professor became a manager with large sums of money at his disposal. For hard scientists, equipment increased and was refined. Accelerators blossomed. Electron microscopes became common. Beginning in the late 1960's, the story line changed. Federal and state funds flowing into education either did not grow or grew at a decreasing rate. Real dollars per faculty member and per student decreased during the early 1970's. In 1974, inflation added to the burdens and the sense of frustration which this situation created. The scenario became one of doing more or the same with less. The real income of our faculty began to decrease. The impact of this twin devil of inflation and a stable income or a decreased rate of increase of that income has had quality and programmatic effects. More importantly, it has had severe impact upon the expectations and morale of a generation which had been raised to believe the revolution of rising expectations was a standard part of its cultural pattern.

For a confluence of reasons, higher education is competing less and less successfully for the state and federal dollars. Priorities have been rearranged and the period of affluence for higher education has passed at least temporarily. I leave to each of you a judgement as to whether those priorities can again be reordered so that higher education receives a higher percentage of the revenues of state and federal governments. I am not optimistic for the near term.

Students - By now the curve which shows a future drop in the number of the traditional college age student is sufficiently familiar so we know the figures did not occur in a nightmare. It is based upon hard figures of individuals now living. The facts are incontrovertible. The decline will be as steep as was the incline. We are witnessing the beginnings of extreme competition for traditional students. Many of these competitive steps impacted upon previously sacrosanct and hallowed traditions. Our grading system has eroded until the grade curve is a national scandal. We give credit by examination. We admit at the junior year of high school. We press for increased financial aid for students.

Competition for the traditional student is being followed by an attempt to expand education to other age groups. The buzz words are career readjustment, upgrading and life-long learning. We install academic programs in prisons. We broadcast television and radio courses to shut-ins and housewives. We cooperate with newspapers to offer courses for credit.

Colleges will increasingly compete for these new students as well as for traditional students. Many seem to be attempting to outdo each other in designing courses to appeal to newly discovered groups. Ignored is the long history of continuing education, the failure of our GENESYS and similar programs, the fact that education should be demanding work. Our attempts to increase access should continue. Claims that major new sources of students can replace the losses visualized through a decrease in the size of the traditional group are unrealistic in my opinion. Caution must be exercised to avoid further deterioration of standards. Opportunity should not be confused with guaranteed success.

As universities excuse students from traditional work on one hand, on the other they seek to augment an artificial demand for college work through licensing and certification requirements. At the present time, we hear only a faint stirring in this direction. In the future, we will see a demand for increased initial educational requirements for licenses and certificates and continuing education requirements for their renewal.

The decrease in the number of students likely to occur in the late 1970's and the 1980's and the confusion arising from the competition for students will raise new and grave questions. For example, increased funding has been geared in part to increases in the number of students. Economies of scale enabled universities to utilize only a portion of the additional money appropriated to support new students. The remainder was diverted to experimentation, innovation and advanced research. The decrease in the number of students will aggravate the economic situation caused by the probability that higher education's share of the state and federal dollars will remain stable or even decrease. The past annual infusion of new funds which enabled improvement in the quality and inauguration of new programs cannot be taken for granted in the future. The advent of unions will render even more rigid that flexibility which we already regard as limited. The potential for a change in our collegial style of governnace is on the horizon. The unwillingness of a governing body to interfere in the internal operation of universities will render it difficult for central boards to moderate the new competition for students.

In these circumstances, central governing bodies will become increasingly vulnerable and seemingly ineffective. They were established to make the educational decisions previously made by the legislature and to plan for orderly growth to assure wise allocation and use of resources. It was their ability to provide additional funds which rendered their restrictive actions acceptable to universities accustomed to autonomy. It was their judicious use of resources which

rendered them acceptable to the legislature. Wise management of resources with shrinking budgets will be more difficult although more imperative. Wise management may call for decisions not palatable individual institutions nor to their local constituencies. Legislators, since they are politicians and since their power derives from local constituencies, can easily differ as to the definition of the wise and judicious distribution of limited funds. The legislature may well demand and expect program adjustment and adjustment in personnel policies which will be repugnant to the universities. As has been the case in the past, boards will be tagged by universities as the supporters and originators of legislative actions which they must implement. Thus, from the universities' standpoint, boards may well appear ineffective advocates and from the legislative standpoint, ineffective managers. Thus, central boards will have an ever more difficult task to preserve their autonomy and to protect higher education while responding to the educational, economic and political necessities of the day. Their success in the past augurs well for their ability to adjust to the abrasiveness of the future. It is important to the welfare of higher education that they do so and in that adjustment maintain the confidence of both the universities and the legislature.

SESSION IV

Personal Perspectives of Federal/State Roles in Postsecondary Education

Robert C. Andringa

A. Observations and Predictions

1. Higher education has lost its former high priority status in the public's mind and in legislatures. Few would increase taxes (or deficits) to increase the total capacity of the collegiate sector.

2. Collegiate institutions becoming defensive; for many, mere survival is a major preoccupation. They seem to lack a governance structure that is flexible enough for the times.

3. Competition for campus-based students in 1980's will create new public issues which institutions cannot resolve without an external referee.

4. In foreseeable future, increasing institutional costs will have to be shared

5. More and more traditional students and "new clienteles" will need to pursue education while they work.

6. Individual rights will often override what are now seen as institutional prerogatives.

B. What to Expect from the Federal Government

1. Total dollar support keeping up with inflation at best.

2. Few new programs; strong emphasis on student assistance as main strategy.

3. Continued recognition in student assistance programs of both degree and non-degree granting institutions (total now about 5700 eligible institutions in postsecondary education).

4. Continued demands on institutions through exercise of regulatory powers; more red tape and criteria to meet as funds

Dr. Andringa is Minority Staff Director for the Education and Labor Committee, U. S. House of Representatives.

become scarce, abuses of federal programs come to light and issues of privacy, discrimination, consumerism, etc. take hold.

C. What Role for the States?

1. No way but up. Who seriously doubts an increasing state role? Motivation will come out of problems within the state, but federal legislation will encourgage the trend.

2. Neither federal government nor an individual institution will be able to take the lead in maintaining a strong postsecondary system in light of the economy . . . enrollment declines . . . collective bargaining . . . public reaction to unemployed college graduates . . . competition for tax support in areas of health, unemployment programs, aging, handicapped education, etc.

3. Most states should increase support to the independent sector to:

   - Prevent over-building public sector
   - Guarantee healthy competition and diversity of opportunities
   - Provide reason for limiting government intrusion into all institutions

4. Strong, fair dealing state agency is a necessary buffer between overzealous (and short term) political pressures and defensive isolationism on the part of academic institutions.

D. Personal Suggestions on State Agency Strategy

1. Take on the role of servant; become bipartisan; influence through informal networks; seek to represent honest perspective of what is current situation and what public policy should be.

2. Emphasize leadership development for both full-time personnel and non-agency "key persons." Encourage interstate exchanges; doctoral study research and internships; share ideas with other states. Not the time for "one man shows" in state agencies.

3. Identify and involve "laymen"--not in token manner. They have good perspective in these times; enjoy unique credibility with the broader community; will keep education out of strictly interest-group politics.

4. Become known as individuals thinking about "education and training" for all adults--not as an agency responsible for "educational institutions." Involve libraries, museums, civic groups, business and government training programs, newspapers, TV and other learning resources.

5. If you err on enrollment projections, err on the pessimistic side. Prepare state leaders and institutions for possible closings, mergers, state assumption of independent schools, reductions in number of programs, etc. Why? Politics and public emotions will play greater role in these decisions than quantitative analysis!

6. Designate one staff person to be accountable for monitoring federal policy process. He should alert others when need for letter, phone call, follow-up, etc.

7. Act not only as a reconciler of immediate crises, but help create a new rationale for and description of "appropriate institutional autonomy."

8. Begin working within the state for coordination of federal funds received through revenue-sharing program, CETA, Vocational Education Act--that's where the big dollars will be.

9. Relax about the current thrust of 1202 commissions. They were not expected to handle all the comprehensive planning of postsecondary education. But they were expected to do relevant planning that included all segments of postsecondary education.

THE 94TH CONGRESS NEEDS TO HEAR FROM LEADERS IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION!

1. Everyone is a "constituent" of two Senators and a Representative in Congress--take advantage of the first-class treatment constituents receive!

2. Should also communicate with members of the committee responsible for specific legislation.

3. Communications should be brief and timely (when the issue is under consideration).

4. Best way to find out status of an issue is to call the appropriate committee office.

5. Personal visits with congressman always good--set up appointments through his district (or state) office unless you can get to Washington.

6. No worry about addresses: To (whomever), U. S. House of Representatives or U. S. Senate--House zip 20515 and Senate zip 20510.

7. Use carbon copies if need be. Send original to committee or subcommittee chairman; copies to Ranking Member, your own Congressman, key committee staff, etc.

8. Get to know Legislative Assistants and Administrative Assistants in your Senator's and Congressman's offices.

9. All legislation is first "marked-up" and voted out of subcommittees. Most of the action is there.

10. Many witnesses appear before committees because they ask to testify. Many simply send statements to the Chairman asking that these be part of the hearing record.

11. The House and the Senate operate quite independently. Likewise, there is little communication between authorizing and appropriations committees. You need to communicate with all.

Authorizing Committees: House

Many committees in the House have some jurisdiction over programs affecting postsecondary education. For example, Interstate and Foreign Commerce handles all health education programs; Veterans' Affairs has the G. I. Bill; Science and Technology has the National Science Foundation; Ways and Means has tax legislation.

The "basic" postsecondary education programs (those administered by the Office of Education) come under the Committee on Education and Labor. This committee has 27 Democrats and 13 Republicans. The Chairman is Carl Perkins (KY) and the Ranking Member is Albert H. Quie (MN). Both of these men serve ex officio on all eight subcommittees. They should hear from you as well as the key subcommittee members.

There are three different education subcommittees in this Committee. The Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education is chaired by James G. O'Hara (MI). Other Democrats are: John Brademas (IN), Mario Biaggi (NY), Ike Andrews (NC), Michael Blouin (IA), Frank Thompson, Jr. (NJ), Ronald Mottl (OH), Augustus F. Hawkins (CA), Shirley Chisholm (NY), Jaime Benitez (PR), Paul Simon (IL), and Tim Hall (IL).

Republicans are: Edwin D. Eshleman (PA), the Subcommittee Ranking Member, John N. Erlenborn (IL), Marvin L. Esch (MI), John Buchanan (AL), and Virginia Smith (NE).

The majority party has separate subcommittee staffs. These individuals organize hearings, print testimony, etc., in addition to advising Mr. O'Hara. The subcommittee Staff Director is Mr. James Harrison, 320 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D. C. 20515. His phone is: (202) 225-8881.

The minority staff is not organized by subcommittees. The primary contact for legislation in postsecondary education is Dr. Robert Andringa, Minority Staff Director, Committee on Education and Labor, 2179 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D. C. 20515. His phone is (202) 225-3725.

Appropriations Committee: House

Most programs authorized by Congress in one law do not get a nickel until a separate appropriations bill becomes law. The House Appropriations Committee is organized into thirteen subcommittees. Each one handles certain federal agency budgets. The Subcommittee on HEW-Labor is responsible for most programs in postsecondary education. It is here that all of the hearings take place. What they decide is most often approved by the Full Committee and sent to the House for debate.

The Democrats on this subcommittee are: Daniel J. Flood (PA), Chairman, William H. Natcher (KY), Neal Smith (IA), Bob Casey (TX), Edward J. Patten (NJ), David R. Obey (WI), Edward R. Roybal (CA), and Louis Stokes (OH).

The Republicans are: Robert H. Michel (IL), Subcommittee Ranking Member, Garner E. Shriver (KS), and Silvio O. Conte (MA).

It is wise to also send copies of correspondence to the Full Committee Chairman, George H. Mahon (TX) and to the Ranking Member, Elford A. Cederberg (MI).

The key subcommittee staff contact for the majority is Mr. Fred Pfluger, Staff Assistant, 2358 Rayburn HOB, Washington, D. C. 20515. His phone is: (202) 225-3508.

The minority contact for subcommittee business is either one of Mr. Michel's Legislative Assistants, Mr. David Kehl and Mr. Tom McMurray in 1415 Longworth HOB. Phone: (202) 225-0197.

Authorizing Committees: Senate

Unlike the House Education and Labor Committee, the Labor and Public Welfare Committee handles both health and most education legislation. The Veterans' Affairs Committee handles the G. I. Bill; the Finance Committee handles tax legislation.

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has nine Democrats and six Republicans. The chairman is Harrison A. Williams, Jr. (NJ) and the Ranking Republican Member is Jacob K. Javits (NY). Chairman Williams and Mr. Javits are assigned to specific subcommittees and are not ex officio on all nine subcommittees.

One Subcommittee on Education has jurisdiction over elementary, secondary, vocational and postsecondary education programs. This subcommittee is chaired by Senator Claiborne Pell (RL). Other Democrats are: Jennings Randolph (WV), Harrison A. Williams, Jr. (NJ), Edward M. Kennedy (MA), Walter F. Mondale (MN), Thomas F. Eagleton (MO), Alan Cranston (CA), and William D. Hathaway (ME).

Republicans are: J. Glenn Beall, Jr. (MD), Subcommittee Ranking Member, Jacob K. Javits (NY), Richard S. Schweiker (PA), Robert T. Stafford (VT), and Robert Taft, Jr. (OH).

The Majority Counsel is Mr. Stephen Wexler, 4228 Dirksen Building, Washington, D. C. 20510. Phone: (202) 224-7666.

The minority staff is not organized by subcommittees. The primary contact for postsecondary education is Mr. Gregory Fusco, Professional Staff Member, 4222 Dirksen Building, Washington, D. C. 20510. Phone: (202) 224-7688.

Appropriations Committee: Senate

This committee, like the House Committee, is organized into thirteen subcommittees. The HEW-Labor Subcommittee is chaired by Senator Warren G. Magnuson (WA) and includes these other Democrats: John Stennis (MS), Robert C. Byrd (WV), William Proxmire (WI), Joseph M. Montoya (NM), Ernest F. Hollings (SC), Thomas F. Eagleton (MO), Birch Bayh (IN), and Lawton Chiles (FL).

The Republican Senators are: Edward W. Brooke (MA), Ranking Member, Clifford P. Case (NJ), Hiram L. Fong (HI), Ted Stevens (AK), and Richard S. Schweiker (PA).

The key majority staff contact for this subcommittee is Mr. Harley Dirks, 1108 Dirksen SOB, Washington, D. C. 20510. Phone: (202) 224-7256.

The minority contact is Mr. Gar Kaganowich, 1245 Dirksen SOB, Washington, D. C. 20510. Phone: (202) 224-7231.

Again, if writing any of these Committee Members, it is good to send a copy to the Chairman of the Full Committee, John McClellan (AR) and to the Ranking Member, Milton R. Young (ND).

Budget Committees: General

Part of the congressional reform of 1974 was the creation of new House and Senate Budget Committees. It is too early to determine how effective they will be. Beginning in 1976, through a series of resolutions from these two committees, the Congress will set spending and revenue collecting priorities in several general areas (education being included in one). The appropriations committees wil then work within the boundaries of these budget resolutions. Public Law 93-344, which created this process, also changed the beginning date for the federal fiscal year--set to be October 1, 1976.

Persons interested in education should watch the development of these new committees, as they are likely to be the target of intensive lobbying efforts.

Budget Committee: House

This committee has 17 Democrats and 8 Republicans. Representative Brock Adams (WA) is Chairman and Delbert L. Latta (OH) is the Ranking Member.

Educators should note these other Members: James G. O'Hara (MI) (also Educaton and Labor) and Neal Smith (IA) (also HEW-Labor Appropriations Subcommittee).

The majority staff contact is Mr. George Gross, 214 House Office Building Annex, Washington, D. C. 20515. Phone: (202) 225-7200.

The minority staff contact is Mr. Mel Miller, 210 House Office Building Annex, Washington, D. C. 20515. Phone: (202) 225-7230.

Budget Committee: Senate

The Senate Budget Committee has 10 Democrats and 6 Republicans. Chairman is Edmund Muskie (ME) and Henry Bellmon (OK) is the Ranking Member.

Of interest to educators, the following Senators also serve: Senators Warren Magnuson (Chairman of the HEW-Labor Appropriations Subcommittee); Ernest Hollings and Lawton Chiles (Members of the HEW-Labor Appropriations Subcommittee); Walter Mondale, Alan Cranston and J. Glenn Beall, Jr. (Members of the Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee).

The majority staff contact is Douglas Bennet, Jr., 301 First Street, N. E., Washington, D. C. 20510. His phone is: (202) 224-0642.

The minority staff contact is Robert Boyd, 301 First Street, N. E., Washington, D. C. 20510. His phone is: (202) 224-0642.

Reminder

If you need to know more than this (and there is more!) never hesitate to call or write your Senators or your Representative.

APPENDIX A

Participants

William B. Chapman
Vice President/Administration
University of Hawaii
2444 Dole Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Harry L. Darling
Specialist/Research and Planning
Rhode Island Department of Education
199 Promenade Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Ken Fischer
Director
Postsecondary Education Convening Authority
Institute for Educational Leadership
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N. W. 310
Washington, D. C. 20036

Warren G. Hill, Project Director
Inservice Education Program
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80203

Bruce Ivey
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Harold H. Kastner, Jr.
Assistant Director
Division of Community Colleges
Room 310, Collins Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Fred Kiehle
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Larry L. Leslie
Professor and Chairman of Higher Education and Research Association
Center for the Study of Higher Education
101 Packley
Penn State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Sylvia V. Lund, Chairman
State Board of Education
Augusta, Maine

Robert B. Mautz
Chancellor, State University System of Florida
107 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Patrick E. McCarthy
Chancellor
Massachusetts Board of Higher Education
182 Tremont Street
Boston, Massachusetts

L. R. Meeth
Associate Professor of Higher Education
SUNY/Buffalo
Maine Street
Buffalo, New York

Ettyce H. Moore
Executive Secretary
D. C. Postsecondary Education Commission
Munsey Building
1329 E Street, NW, Suite 1023
Washington, D. C. 20004

Ben L. Morton
West Virginia Board of Regents
1316 Charleston National Plaza
Charleston, West Virginia

Alfred C. O'Connell
Executive Director
State Board for Community Colleges
Maryland
Annapolis, Maryland

R. Wayne Richey
Executive Secretary
Iowa State Board of Regents
Des Moines, Iowa

James R. Rowell, Jr.
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Vernon I. Simpson
Associate in Higher Education
Commission for Higher Education
340 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut

Sherry Thomas
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

James L. Wattenbarger
Director, Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Donald H. Winandy
Director of Program Planning
Commission for Higher Planning
P. O. Box 1320
Hartford, Connecticut 06101

Prince B. Woodard
President
Mary Washington College
Fredericksburg, Virginia 22401

Peter N. Woodberry
Postsecondary Education Planner
Department of Education
199 Promenade Street
Providence, R. I. 02908

Kenneth E. Wright
Director
Community College Program
New Jersey Department of
Higher Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey